THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN

IN DEFENSE OF THE CONSTITUTION

Subscribers In All 49 States

RETURN ADDRESS
7314 Zimpel Street
New Orleans 18, Louisiana

BULK RATE
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
New Orleans, La.
Permit No. 330

FORM 3547 Requested

Vol. V - No. 7 **OCTOBER, 1959** **New Orleans, La.**

WILL THE DEMOCRATS "RUN" ROCKEFELLER?

By Phoebe Courtney, Editor

The presidential primary campaigns, prior to the 1960 nominating conventions of the Democrat and the Republican parties, may turn into the biggest "wheel-spinning" operations of all time. Perhaps we will find that Messrs. Kennedy, Johnson, Humphrey and Symington are all running just for the exercise. Although Kennedy may enter the Democrat Convention with the largest number of pledged delegates, it could well be that as the hours tick by in roll-call after roll-call, Kennedy will see his strength evaporate, and a "compromise" candidate selected; none other than old two-time loser, Adlai Stevenson, who was chosen a long time ago by the hard core of left-wing Socialists who control the Democrat Party.

But why, you may ask, would the Democrat Party, which apparently "snowed" the G.O.P. in the Congressional off-year elections in 1958, consider nominating a man - Adlai Stevenson who is sure to lose?

That seemingly unanswerable question can be matched by another: "Why does Paul Butler, National Chairman of the Democrat Party continue his warfare with the Southern Democrats?

None of it makes sense - does it? Or DOES it?

This whole scheme DOES make sense IF.....

But first let's briefly discuss the important part that the South plays, wittingly or unwittingly, in this master plan.

THE SOUTH HAS BEEN "WRITTEN OFF"

Why does Paul Butler keep sniping at the South,...bearing down and then easing off,...and then bearing down again? Each separate attack on the South by Paul Butler brings forth a spate of press releases from Southern politicians who futilely call for Butler's resignation.

Paul Butler knows that in order for the Democrats to retain complete mastery of Congress, the platform for 1960 must contain a very strong Civil Rights plank in order to appeal to minority bloc votes in the big cities in the North. This is what Reuther and his cohorts demand.

Butler further knows that even if he adopted a softer policy toward the South, he still could not count solidly on the South. The South may bolt the Party and vote for independent electors, as they continue to threaten to do, (for home consumption!) or the South may only half-heartedly support the Democrat nominee.

With this in mind, WHY should Butler, Reuther and the Northern Liberals who control the Democrat Party, make any concessions whatsoever to the South?

The South's position in the Democrat Nominating Convention has now been neutralized...Butler doesn't care whether they "walk out" of the Party, or not. At the last minute Butler et als can recognize rump delegations from the South and "lock out" the duly-elected Southern delegates. The result of such action would be that the "regular" Democrats would merely go home and rally their States for independent electors, and the Southern electoral vote would STILL be lost to the Democrat candidate.

Therefore, would it not appear that the Democrat Party, KNOWING IT CAN'T WIN THE PRESIDENCY WITH ANY OF ITS CANDIDATES, will concentrate on capturing overwhelming control of both the House and the Senate?

ROCKEFELLER ENTERS THE PICTURE

Walter Reuther has already voiced his approval of Nelson Rockefeller, saying Rockefeller would "make a good Democrat". It will be remembered that when Rockefeller campaigned for the governorship of New York, he went out of his way to avoid the tag "Republican".

What better candidate could the Socialist-Democrat Party have than Nelson Rockefeller? His extreme leftwingism is well known - he would be content with the strongest possible Civil Rights platform that the Democrats could write, and - he'd use his own private funds to pay his campaign expenses as he ran as a so-called Republican! Where could the Democrats find a better "bargain"!

Rockefeller's election, with the TACIT APPROVAL OF THE DEMOCRAT LEADERS, would be the final nail in the coffin of the Republican party.

There would then be fastened upon once-free America, the tyrannical tenacles of ONE-PARTY government - just like Communist Russia. Oh, the Socialist-Democrat-Republicans would probably attempt to cling to the pretense of two separate party labels in an attempt to fool the American people, but it would be obvious that the TWO-PARTY SYSTEM HAD BEEN DESTROYED.

* * * * * *

There is only one way to RESTORE THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM and that is through the establishment of a NEW NATIONAL CONSERVATIVE PARTY which will oppose and ultimately defeat the two "old" Socialist parties, formerly known as Democrat and Republican.

A new party is the only answer!

Democratic Discord Deepens, Threatening Presidential Chances

(Excerpts from an article by Robert D. Novak in the WALL STREET JOURNAL)

WASHINGTON - September 17. As the Democratic Party's National Committee gathered in a ballroom of the Sheraton-Park Hotel here yesterday, there was a dutiful effort to soft-pedal discord and emphasize harmony. The attempt fell somewhat short of the mark.

Yesterday's National Committee session points up the intensity of the strife, as much by what was left unsaid as by what was spoken.

A CHANCE TO VOTE

The committee endorsed without debate the watered-down Southern "loyalty oath" approved by the 1956 convention. This asserts "the understanding" that state party officials will give the voters of their States a chance to vote for the Democratic Presidential nominee. Only a chorus of Southern-accent "no's" broke the harmony of adopting the resolution. But this is not the entire story.

"Why didn't we put up a fight?" says one Southern committee member. "Well, we didn't have a chance to win in the first place. But, mainly we didn't fight because it doesn't mean a thing, it isn't binding." Most Southerners agree the "loyalty oath" would

See DISCORD....Page Six

Nixon's "Rocky" Road

By Kent Courtney, Publisher

Ted Lewis, columnist in the NEW YORK DAILY NEWS, recently devoted his column "Capital Circus" to the subject of the impact of Khrushchev's visit on the presidential election in 1960. Commenting on the attitude of the crowds that witnessed Khrushchev's tour of Washington and New York, and describing himself as a "crowd-watcher" of many years' experience, Mr. Lewis stated:

"It was as if an almost miraculous, and definitely unrehearsed display of patriotism - of anti-Communism - was occurring... it was as if a spontaneous grass-roots uprising was being born - an uprising of popular feeling ready to sweep out of office in the next election all politicians favoring appeasement or a glossed-over 'deal' with the Kremlin."

Mr. Lewis gave further indication of the political repercussions of the Khrushchev visit by stating: "Some Republican Party officials are almost hysterically worried about what is now going on. Even the well-poised GOP Sen. Barry Goldwater, in a Chicago appearance, now claims that Vice President Nixon was 'shocked' at Ike's original idea of having Khrushchev come to the U.S.A. for informal summit talks. Goldwater knows that the present mood of the nation may develop into a tremendous, angry force."

Senator Goldwater's statement about Nixon being "shocked" over Eisenhower's invitation to Khrushchev, the pudgy, pig-necked temperous despot from the Kremlin, is somewhat mystifying. How could Nixon be "shocked" when the invitation was extended at almost the precise moment that Nixon, himself, was shaking the bloody hand of the Butcher of Budapest!

However, the day after Senator Goldwater's apologist statement about Nixon, Nixon repudiated Goldwater's statement. Said Nixon in Hartford, Conn.: "I believe the decision (to invite Khrushchev) was justified and wise." Further, one of Nixon's aides denied that Nixon was "surprised" and "disappointed" as Sen. Goldwater had charged, Nixon's aide said that the Vice President knew the invitation had been extended before he left for Moscow.

Nixon's repudiation of Senator Goldwater's statement leaves the Arizona Senator in a rather embarrassing position. Will Goldwater still support Nixon's candidacy?

And does Nixon have any chance at all of being nominated?

* * * * * *

WATCH ROCKEFELLER!

The Eisenhower brothers, Milton and Ike, have kept Nixon so busy making a pilgrimage to the Kremlin, that he hasn't had time to note the first signs of the Rockefeller campaign, masterminded by the slickest propagandists in this nation with unlimited funds at their disposal. Nixon should have analyzed the calculated, step-by-step build-up that is now starting for Rockefeller. He should have weighed the political implications of a lengthy "human interest-regular guy" article on Rockefeller in the SATURDAY EVENING POST, which was promptly followed by a condensed version in the READERS DIGEST reaching possibly 4 million readers throughout the nation.

Several months ago this newspaper, THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN predicted that Nelson Rockefeller would steam-roller Nixon at the GOP Nominating Convention in 1960.

And now, two of Nixon's staunchest supporters are reluctantly coming to that conclusion.

HUMAN EVENTS, the noted Conservative newsletter in Washington, D.C., in trying to cushion its Nixon-supporter readers for his ultimate political demise stated on September 23: "Despite Nixon's lead in his race with Rockefeller, none of the Vice President's entourage has any illusions about the great power residing in Rockefeller's wealth and connections." HUMAN EVENTS then goes on to discuss how delegates to the GOP Nominating Convention can be influenced, and quotes a statement from a political pro as follows: "If you were a delegate to the convention and were a lawyer say in Indiana, and got a phone call from a Rockefeller-controlled big law firm in New York making a pitch in favor of Rocky, what would you do? You had been receiving a lot of business from that law firm and you do not want to lose it. I guess the question answers itself."

In other words, Rockefeller, one of the richest men in the

See NIXON....Page 6

Harry Truman Would Have Been Impeached

Speaking in Huntsville, Ala., the other night, Senator Symington of Missouri, possible Democrat nominee for the presidency in 1960, spoke truly when he said that President Harry Truman would have been impeached had he invited Khrushchev to this country.

SYMINGTON, IN THIS ONE SENTENCE, SPOTLIGHTED THE LONG, SORRY ROAD OF APPEASEMENT DOWN WHICH PRESIDENT EISENHOWER HAS LED THIS NATION SINCE 1952.

Under President Eisenhower's leadership, the United States lost its first war in history, the Korean War. The entire, long record of the Eisenhower administration has been one of RETREAT, RETREAT, RETREAT. We lost Vietnam. We did nothing about Hungary. We lost Tibet. We lost Iraq in the Middle East.

No one can point to a single success by this country against the Communists since Mr. Eisenhower took over as President.

(Reprinted from Manchester (N.H.) UNION LEADER

Bridges Feels Gloomy Over Future of GOP

By SARAH McCLENDON

WASHINGTON — Sen. Styles Bridges gloomily pondered today what he feels are certain to be sad prospects for the Republican Party as a result of the visit here of Russia's Premier Khrushchev.

"There can be absolutely no good come from it," said Bridges as he sadly looked at the floor. "The evil effects may not be apparent immediately but I fear ultimately this can have only a dangerous effect on the future of our party. The future will show our fear, nothing but evil resulting from this trip."

Bridges, who was largely instrumental in preventing an appearance by Khrushchev before a joint session of Congress is showing what he thinks of Khrushchev by leaving Washington for New Hampshire on the day the Russian premier arrives.

(Reprinted from the Manchester (N.H.) UNION LEADER)

Reds Are Bluffing Us Into Surrender

By Fulton Lewis, Jr.

(Copyright, 1959, King Features Syndicate, Inc.)

WASHINGTON, AUGUST 6 -- Connecticut's freshman Democratic Senator Thomas Dodd, the former FBI agent who won his spurs with a ringing denunciation of appeasement over Berlin last February, is continuing to impress Washington observers as the outstanding member of this year's crop of Senate newcomers.

Dodd, who courageously supported the confirmation of Lewis Strauss and the McClellan labor bill of rights, has now impressed Pentagon top brass with his realistic and detailed analysis of the Communist military situation.

Sen. Dodd has logically concluded that the Reds will not risk war over Berlin or any other piece of real estate because they can't afford the dangers inherent in any military showdown. A long succession of uprisings behind the Iron Curtain has demonstrated three things:

(1) That the satellite army divisions are totally unreliable;
(2) That the Soviet Army itself is dangerously unreliable;
(3) That the masses of people under Communism share a common hatred for the regime which oppresses them.

Sen. Dodd's analysis of the Communist military situation has been particularly noted by top military men I have talked with, all of whom expressed the hope that the striped pants boys in Geneva would sit up and take notice.

It was almost 20 years ago, when the Nazi armies of Hitler invaded the Soviet Union, that the world got its first real indication as to the loyalty of the Communist land armies. Although the Reds enjoyed overwhelming superiority in manpower, aircraft, tanks and artillery, the Russian Army defected in droves. The civilian population greeted the Nazi armies as liberators, and there was singing in the streets of Moscow as the German troops drove the Communist government far into the interior of Russia. It was only the brutality of the Nazis that finally enabled the massive Red Army -- which outnumbered the Germans by almost 10 to one -- to achieve victory.

World War II ended 14 years ago, of course, but there is abundant information that the situation is no different today.

Soviet battalions originally stationed in Hungary in the 1956 uprising had to be withdrawn in the first rounds of battle because they refused to bear arms against the Hungarian people. And whole divisions of Red troops later defected to the Freedom Fighters and fought for a cause that was doomed to defeat, because the so-called Free World refused any sort of aid, moral or material.

It is estimated that 15,000 troops in Budapest deserted to fight with the Hungarians, and huge losses were reported from the elite Soviet Second Guards Division. That is equivalent to soldiers of the U.S. Marines or the British Guards deserting under fire.

One Hungarian prison camp alone housed 10,000 Red Army deserters after the revolt had been quashed, and thousands of others were shipped in boxcars back to the Soviet Union.

If the Russian Army itself is unreliable, the armies of the various satellite nations are completely untrustworthy as far as the Kremlin's military planners are concerned. Not a single satellite division could be counted upon to fight the Western Powers. And neither, for that matter, could the Red divisions in those countries.

The 33 divisions which the Kremlin maintains in Eastern Europe -- 22 in East Germany, seven in Hungary, two in Rumania, and two in Poland -- would have their work cut out for them keeping the people down, and again the probability is that the Russian soldiers would desert as they did in Hungary.

As the crucial negotiations on Berlin evaporated in Geneva, and as the agitation for some settlement, any settlement, grows on the part of the appeasers, it is necessary to face up to these facts. And it is necessary, as Sen. Dodd has said, that we call the Soviet bluff on the Warsaw Pact, which supposedly binds together the satellite countries and the "Motherland" in military alliance.

There are over a million troops of the captive nations that are being used to blackmail us, and the truth is that not one satellite division would ever fight against the West. They should not worry us, but should reassure us. For they are Mr. Khrushchev's biggest problem, and the reason that there will be no imminent war in Europe.

EQUAL PROTECTION

While Khrushchev was visiting this country the U.S. Atlas-Able rocket being readied for a U. S. moon shot exploded on its launching pad during a test.

The United States spent hundreds of thousands of taxpayers' dollars for "security" precautions to protect this hated man, Khrushchev, from would-be assassins.

Why not spend some of those U.S. taxpayer dollars to provide complete PROTECTION OF OUR MISSILE PROGRAM FROM ANY POSSIBLE SABOTAGE?

NEW PARTY RALLY TO BE HELD IN CHICAGO

MORRISON HOTEL — OCT. 23-24

Principal Speakers:

J. Bracken Lee
Former Governor of Utah

Dan Smoot
Publisher and Newscaster



J. Bracken Lee



Dan Smoot

In brief, Governor Lee reasons that government, at any level, should function as any business enterprise should function; that there is no substitute for honesty, efficiency and fair play.

Campaigning on a pledge of instituting honesty, efficiency and economy in government, Governor Lee was first elected to the gubernatorial office in 1948 (which otherwise was a Democratic year), and was re-elected in 1952. His election in 1948 broke a 24-year grip that Democrats had held on the Governor's office.

In his first four years in office, Governor Lee set out at a whirlwind pace in putting his brief campaign pledge into operation. He immediately fired a scandal-ridden Liquor Commission, shook up a patronage-loaded Road Commission, took politics out of the Welfare Department, slashed budgets in most departments, trimmed payrolls, and instituted long-needed, business-like procedures in a State governmental operation that had proved far too costly and ineffective over the years.

It was this clear-cut fight for efficiency and economy that aroused the nation's magazine writers. Within a matter of months, news articles about Governor Lee's efforts appeared in Newsweek and Time magazines, feature articles in Life, Saturday Evening Post, and American Magazine, and columns and editorials in countless newspapers throughout the Country.

Nor did the passage of time slow his efforts. On August 24, 1951, almost three years after his election, the Salt Lake Times, a Democratic weekly and a constant critic of the Lee administration, noted that while many candidates have promised economy, Governor Lee was different in "that he not only made the promise but is making every effort to keep it."

More recently (February 18, 1955) the Deseret News-Telegram of Salt Lake City, which has been critical of the Governor on numerous occasions, defended his administrative record in an editorial which said in part: " . . . no governor of recent memory has operated the Statehouse more efficiently or more openly for public inspection. There has been no breath of scandal in any State department in his two terms."

Governor Lee's accomplishments and the principles he adhered to in the conduct of governmental affairs have given many people a renewed faith in the future of our form of government. As former President Herbert Hoover so aptly put it: "If we had Governors like yours in every state, they could save this Nation." (Salt Lake Telegram, August 2, 1951.)

Dan Smoot, former administrative assistant to J. Edgar Hoover, had an outstanding career in the F.B.I. which included three and a half years investigating Communism in the industrial midwest.

Dan Smoot reaches every week a radio and television audience estimated in excess of one million persons with his clear and compelling interpretation of the burning issues of the day. Mr. Smoot will be one of the featured speakers at the New Party Rally on Saturday night October 24th in the Constitution Room of the Morrison Hotel. Dan Smoot has come to the conclusion that America needs a new political party and that will be the subject of his talk at the rally.

American patriots sometimes bemoan the fact that pro-American commentators are not available on a national network, sponsored by national companies. Dan Smoot is sponsored by a dog food manufacturer (Dr. Ross Dog Food) of Los Angeles. Mr. D. B. Lewis, Dan's sponsor, tells of the results of sponsoring Dan Smoot's interpretation of issues facing America, when he states that some people go out and buy dogs and cats, become pet owners for the first time, just so they can buy Dr. Ross Dog Food, in order that Dan's program can continue to be heard! The story is also told that increases in sales were noted after just eight weeks of sponsorship of Dan's weekly television programs.

The American people want to hear the Conservative side of the news, all we have to do is let the advertisers know about the success of Dan Smoot in selling Dog Food, and his services will soon be in demand by other advertisers. Come to the NEW PARTY RALLY and hear Dan Smoot!

SPECIAL!

for additional news on New Party Rally in Chicago.

See pages 3 and 4

Union Bosses Reveal Their Contempt For The Public

(Reprinted from Charleston NEWS & COURIER)

In a series of Labor Day harangues, the bosses of organized labor made clear their bitter-end-resistance to reform. The country applauded the labor reform bill passed by Congress last week, but the men in whose hands union power is held spoke angrily of political vengeance.

The union bosses were once keenly aware of shifts in public opinion. Now they seem unable to realize that the public insists that the country be run by its elected leaders, not by a handful of labor chieftains.

George Meany, AFL-CIO president, in a bitter statement revealing this lack of comprehension, said: "Big business leaders are doing everything in their power to weaken and destroy our labor movement."

The labor movement is losing the authority it enjoyed during

See BOSSES..Pg. 6

The Independent American

Published approximately every four to six weeks by
FREE MEN SPEAK, INC.
7314 Zimpel Street • New Orleans 18, Louisana

Kent H. Courtney ..... President
Phoebe Greene Courtney .....Editor and Secty. - Treasurer

Entered as third class matter at the New Orleans Post Office

COPYRIGHT 1959 BY FREE MEN SPEAK, INC.

SUBSCRIPTION RATE: One year (or 12 issues): $3.00; two years (or 24 issues): $5.00.

OUR POLICY

This newspaper is dedicated to the defeat of Socialist and Communist influences that now pervade the thinking and the policies of our Federal government and the two major political parties. We believe that there is no difference between a New Deal Democrat and a Socialist-Internationalist Republican.

This newspaper will continue to promote all individuals and organizations who believe that a new political party based on Constitutional States Rights is the answer to the Socialism that has captured both (formerly great) parties.

We will never align ourselves with any person or group which preaches hatred. Instead we will conserve our energy for the fight against atheistic Communism, and we pledge ourselves to LOVE OF GOD AND AN INDEPENDENT U.S.A.

OUR THANKS

Because we are political and "controversial" we have no advertising income. We therefore thank all of our readers who send donations every week so that more and more sample copies can be sent to patriots throughout the country. Without this regular support, this experiment in patriotic and political journalism would not be possible.

FEDERAL AID IS CHILDISH

ONLY little children believe that they get something for nothing—or for just "being good."

Yet school boards plump for "Federal Aid" to build local schools. States and counties demand "their share" of Washington billions for roads. Areas that call themselves "depressed" (who isn't?) want Federal dollars to make them prosperous. Thousands expect jobs to be brought to them by national subsidies rather than move to where jobs are. Builders want Federal aid so they can build more housing at a profit.

"Federal Aid"? *There is no such thing.* The money can only come from the taxpayers, from *you*. For every $1 in Federal "aid" the average state "gets back" from Washington, you pay *to* Washington $7 in Federal taxes.

Why should you pay for "benefits" to someone a thousand miles away—and why should he pay for yours? The only one who "benefits" in this sleight of hand is the tax collector. You'd be better off to keep your money and pay your own bills—and save the difference, and your self-respect.

(An advertisement appearing in U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT by Warner & Swazey of Cleveland, Ohio,)

WASHINGTON WISDOM

Just a few weeks ago, those who look to Washington as the source of all wisdom, all solutions-- and all money---were wringing their hands and crying that the Federal Government must do more to solve the problem of dropping egg prices.

Those who consider Washington the sole instrument of wise solutions should take a look at what Washington was doing.

During the past two months, the Federal Government spent seven million of the taxpayers' dollars to buy up egg surpluses resulting from overproduction ---while lending 1.1 million of the taxpayers' dollars to help more people get into the egg production business, thus inviting bigger surplus!

Radio Edition Moves To Saturday On W.L.S. Chicago

THE RADIO EDITION OF THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN formerly heard each Tuesday at 7:00 P.M. on W.L.S. Chicago has now been moved to Saturday.

Listen to THE RADIO EDITION OF THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN each Saturday night at 7 P.M. on W.L.S. Chicago 890 on your radio dial.....Kent Courtney, publisher of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN Newspaper, is the weekly commentator.

LISTEN TO THE RADIO EDITION OF THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN

CHICAGO AND MIDWEST AREA

Every Saturday night at 7:00 P.M. Chicago time over the 50,000-watt Prairie Farmer station, W.L.S.--890 on your radio dial - - sponsored by the subscribers of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN newspaper.

THE RADIO EDITION OF THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN on Radio Station WLS Chicago is supported entirely by contributions from the subscribers of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN newspaper, and will continue to broadcast these programs indefinitely--that is, as long as contributions make this possible.

GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA

Every Saturday 5:15 P.M. over station W.D.V.H. 5,000-watts 980 on your dial. Radio time was donated by the station so that THE RADIO EDITION OF THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN could be heard as a "public service".

KERMIT, TEXAS

Every Sunday at 12:30 P.M. over station K.E.R.B. sponsored by AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT of Kermit, Texas.

GREENVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA

Every Saturday at 1:30 P.M. over radio station W.M.U.U., 1260 on your dial, sponsored by The Independent American Committee of Greenville, S.C.

The purpose of THE RADIO EDITION OF THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN is to give the Conservative side of the vital issues concerning this country today.

CONSERVATIVE PROGRAMS AVAILABLE FOR LOCAL SPONSORSHIP

If you and your friends, or your business firm, would like to have these programs played over your local radio station just write to Kent Courtney, P.O. Box 4223, New Orleans 18, Louisiana, for complete details.

NEW STATION ADDED

THE RADIO EDITION OF THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN is now being heard over station W.H.B.B. in Selma, Alabama, each Sunday at 6:00 P.M., 1490 on your dial. Station W.H.B.B. in Selma has agreed to carry THE RADIO EDITION free of charge as a public service.



Splinters With The Planks

By Adras LaBorde

(Reprinted from Alexandria, La. DAILY TOWN TALK)

HUMPHREY: SINS OF COMMISSION

The electorate is beginning to scan the presidential hopefuls from the Senate who are homeward bound standing on platforms with lots of splinters along with the planks.

Each is vulnerable -- some because of sins of commission, others because of sins of omission in the session of Congress just ended.

Sen. Hubert Humphrey, the Minnesota Democrat, is a good one to look at first, since nobody would rather be president. His errors are due to commissions; his bills this year have touched upon everything socialistic from juvenile delinquency to country living.

He authored an idea to set up youth camps in the best tradition of Adolf Hitler, proposed changes in the world court set-up so that outsiders could tell these United States in which cases the world organization has jurisdiction in matters affecting the U.S., and he has suggested a Commission on Country Life to spend a quarter-million dollars a year on such nebulous projects as one "to identify major gaps between the problems of country residents and the organized means to handle their problems."

THREE OTHERS LIKE HIM

Then there's Sen. Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas, who ballyhooed an unemployment commission which would "taste, smell, feel and hear the despair of those parts of the country where men and women cannot find work."

Sen. John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, generally the lead man in the polls to test the strength of Democratic aspirants, will best be remembered for his rather weak labor-reform bill.

Then there is Sen. Stuart Symington of Missouri, fourth among the presidential hopefuls in the Senate. His spending schemes were designed to win friends and votes, although none became law in 1959.

He asked that the Army give or sell some of its white phosporous to industries manufacturing farm fertilizers, sponsored bills to erect memorials on Spanish-American War battlefields in Cuba, and sought a $30 million federal office building for Kansas City, in his home state.

Mr. Symington's vote on the left-of-center proposals of his colleagues identified him more clearly than anything he authored on his own.

GOOSE EGG FOR RIGHT-WINGERS

To date that's the line-up. No Republican senator on the presidentail horizon. Perhaps it is because the GOP has Vice President Nixon and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York, and who in the Senate would dare clash with either?

And the Democrats have nothing from the Senate to offer the Southern conservatives, the Jeffersonian Democrats elsewhere, and the vast army of independent voters who decide national elections every four years.

Outside the Senate the Democrats can call only upon Adlai Stevenson, two-time loser, or such governors as Pat Brown of California or Robert Meyner of New Jersey. Neither would pull the party out of the liberal rut.

The poor we always have with us; ditto the social-Democrats.

DO YOU KNOW?--That as of January 1, 1959, the federal government had no less than 2,543 persons on the payroll just to run the Bureau of the Public Debt!

Communists Rewrite American History

(Reprinted from FREEDOM'S FACTS AGAINST COMMUNISM)

When we first learned years ago that Russian Communists were re-writing their own history to eliminate "traitors" and praise "heroes" of the moment, we were first amazed, then amused. Beria, Stalin, then Malenkov took the historian's route from fame and acclaim to various degrees of oblivion. Old Bolsheviks, long-ago purged and buried by Stalin, were resurrected in print by unscrupulous Red writers.

Now they're giving U. S. history the treatment. Herbert Aptheker, editor of the U.S. Communist Party's magazine, Political Affairs, is re-writing American history from the point of view of a Marxist-Leninist.

ELEVEN VOLUMES TO COME

The first volume, "The Colonial Era," is just now rolling off the presses of International Publishers in New York City. Eleven more volumes are scheduled to follow. The twelve-volume opus will be called History of the American People.

How true a history will it be? Anyone who dips into the first volume will get the feeling of a man walking in a room full of clever distortion mirrors--like the ones in the funhouse. The difference is that Aptheker is not writing for fun.

In his words some of our greatest moments become a series of class struggles, butchery of Indians, chattel slavery, wars of plunder and exploitation of what he calls the "farm and industrial" masses.

No less a critic than the U.S. Communists' grand old man, William Z. Foster, sums up the first volume for us in these words: "The whole trend of Comrade Aptheker's book is to lay the basis for a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the American Revolution. This is one of the most written up subjects in the world, but--from the evidence in the first volume--we can rest assured that Comrade Aptheker will lend it fresh content and meaning."

WRITTEN FOR THE "MASSES"

Are these volumes which are written by Aptheker and praised by Foster being written for Communists? Far from it. They are priced at $2 per volume and are "designed for popular reading and wide circulation." Their aim is to teach the distorted Marxist-Leninist views of American history to working youth and students, and for an important reason.

Youth who know American history well will laugh off Aptheker's writings as a joke. But young people and others who have little or no previous knowledge of our history (and there are many such) probably would accept his views as true.

Improved teaching of American history in schools and through groups working with youth--and widespread exposure of this series of a Communist-distorted account of American history--is the obvious counteraction to this deceptive and dangerous ideological offensive by "Comrade Aptheker."

Soviet, Chinese And Cuban Reds Team Up

(Reprinted from THE HERALD of the Dominican Republic)

CIUDAD TRUJILLO--A direct working alliance between Soviet and Communist Chinese political warfare experts and the Cuban Revolutionary Government was reported August 28 by the Chief of the Dominican Republic's Military Intelligence Service, (SIM).

Lt. Col. John Abbes Garcia, SIM chief, accused Cuban armed forces commander Raul Castro of close collaboration with Soviet agent Vadim Kotchergin "to overthrow by violence the governments of Nicaragua, Guatemala, Panama, and the Dominican Republic."

Abbes, who predicted the invasions of Panama, Nicaragua and the D.R., also told reporters that the SIM has uncovered a gigantic Soviet financial pipeline into the Caribbean.

"More than $25 million has been transferred from Switzerland to Havana," he said, "to finance waves of violence and create conditions favorable to the overthrow of constitutional governments."

Colonel Abbes cited the names of several top Cuban revolutionary officers who are participating in "a vast conspiracy against the political stability and security of the nations of this hemisphere." He named "Juan Martinez, Tinguaro, Garcia Sierra, and others in the Cuban Revolutionary Army."

The SIM chief also reported the presence of agents from satellite countries in the Caribbean revolutionary movement. He charged that "The Cubans are receiving aid and advice from Chinese Czech and Hungarian technicians in the service of the international apparatus of the Soviet Union."

The SIM report follows a warning last week by deputy di-Intelligence agency, C. P. Cabell, who charged that Vadim Kotchergin entered Cuba last May to advise Cuban Communists.

"An appeaser is one who feeds a crocodile--hoping it will eat him last!"
-- Sir Winston Churchill

Brack Lee SAYS

Our Constitution guarantees to every citizen equal consideration under the law.

J. Bracken Lee

The new deal, socialistic, one-world philosophy as now practiced by both political parties has destroyed this constitutional guarantee by setting up a preferred class of citizens---the bureaucrats and organized minorities, who get the money, the privileges, and the immunities.

The rest of us, the great majority, are the slaves who pay this bill.

(Reprinted from THE AMERICAN STATESMAN)

Headway

(Reprinted from Charleston, S.C. NEWS & COURIER)

When the first session of the 86th Congress began eight months ago, conservatives feared that a new Deal might be in the offing. "Liberal" Democrats had defeated several Republican conservative senators.

Actually, the fears proved unjustified. The far-left crowd in the Democratic Party failed to take leadership from the middle-of-the-road "liberals" represented by Sen. Lyndon Johnson of Texas. As a result, Federal spending did not total even what the President asked for in his budget. Federal aid for schools and so-called depressed areas--two big giveaway programs favored by the "liberals"--were shelved. Radical race legislation never came up for debate. Surprisingly, a labor reform bill cleared Congress for the first time in 12 years.

We attribute the defeat of the radicals to energetic conservative action. Even stronger action will be needed next year when the second session begins. With a presidential campaign season ahead, Congress will be under heavy pressure to pass legislation desired by radical pressure groups.

URBAN RENEWAL IS ECONOMIC CANNIBALISM

(Reprinted from the ODESSA (Tex.) AMERICAN)

William Zeckendorf is a real estate promoter. He is president of Webb and Knapp, Inc. of New York. Zeckendorf as a promoter and developer of real estate deserves and receives our admiration. But Zeckendorf as a man who must employ the force of government in order to wrest property from individuals so that he can proceed on his arrogant and roughshod way, is deserving of our contempt and criticism.

At a Chamber of Commerce luncheon in New Orleans, Mr. Zeckendorf revealed himself rather throughly. He said:

"You must have a master plan....You must be able to dedicate or to pledge the responsibility for the re-development concept in the hands of an abjective-minded....commission that will declare what areas are blighted and what are sub-standard; what areas must be re-zoned and re-developed for the benefit of the community."

Just to make certain that we do not misunderstand this tycoon, let us continue with his remarks.

"This is the only area in which I say you must depart from the pure form of democracy in which the individual rights must be observed. This is the case where the community right is more important than the individual because it is a matter of license rather than a matter of privilege for any one individual to be allowed to flourish excessive worship of the idea of private property, to be able to stand out against the development project which is in the interest of the community."

Perhaps Mr. Zeckendorf, in his zeal and ambition to promote large developments, is unconscious of the fact that he is actually quoting Karl Marx. But conscious or unconscious of the evil thought he has expressed, the idea that a man is not important in himself, but only important as he serves the community, is implicit in all socialism.

This is revealed by the statement in the Russian Constitution which proclaims that all rewards are to be made on the following basis: "From each according to ability, to each according to his work." In Russia and any other Socialist country, each man is unimportant except as he may serve the State.

This is the policy followed by all zoners and planners in any community whatsoever. The concept at the base of all zoning and planning is that "society" will be served by the force of government, in which the rights of individuals to their property will be abrogated.

This is economic cannibalism. It sets forth the idea that the tribe can be benefitted by the destruction of any individual who might appear to stand in the way of tribal "good". It should be seen, even by those not necessarily personally involved, that the loss of the right to own property by one individual, is an immediate removal of this right from all individuals. If the community can condemn one man's property for "social" purposes, it follows that, in a matter of time, no man can be secure in his property.

And this is the direction invariably taken by totalitarian thinkers who, like Zeckendorf, rely upon brutal expropriation of property in an effort to accomplish something worthwhile.

All around the nation Mr. Zeckendorf's conclusions are being praised by men in government. The particular program to be sired by this thinking is called "Urban Renewal". By means of urban renewal, politicans can and will seize your property, raze it to the bare earth, and then sell it to some other man who may want to do something with it that you would not think of doing.

This is absolute cannibalism conducted with private property. It is a vicious mis-use of power. It strikes at the roots of the ideas of free enterprise, of private ownership, of self-restraint and self-discipline. It destroys the rights and opportunities of any one individual to take care of himself by means of his own planning and his own industry.

HOW DID IT HAPPEN?

By Tom Anderson

(Reprinted from FARM & RANCH magazine)

"We will bury you," Khrushchev has told us. (He means under rubble, not under ground.) And many Americans in the know say Russia could win the war today. Is it true? If so, how did we get in this position? To know where we are and where we're going it helps to understand where we've been.

Let's look back to 1933. Our socialist-labor welfare state was just getting underway, so it was perfectly natural for its sire, Franklin Roosevelt, to "recognize" the Russian communist dictatorship.

Then came the beer hall putsch and a little mustached madman took over Germany. And Hitler, (whom we all hated) and Stalin, (whom Roosevelt and Truman said they liked) agreed to carve up the world between them--until such time as one could swallow up the other.

Our great leaders were determined to "make the world safe for democracy," again. So we saved our Russian Allies from Hitler's hordes. I believe historians will eventually say (if Khrushchev doesn't bury all them, too) that Germany and Russia would have destroyed each other had we sat on the sidelines and watched, as many of us reactionary "isolationists" (people who believe America comes first) pled for.

We were fighting the wrong war, at the wrong time, against the wrong enemy. We were fighting a war we couldn't win. Because we were allies with Christendom's and history's worst menace: godless, communist, Russia. Our Army was even made to hold back entering Berlin, so our Russian Allies could share it with us. Then, when we had Japan on her knees, Russia committed what should have been an act of war against us: she jumped into the Japanese war, a few days before we ended it.

Our political history is a little "indefinite" on this, but I believe it is generally agreed that Russia was asked by our leaders to get in the Pacific War and share the spoils. "Good Old Joe" was not really bad, you know. All Russia needed was to "understand" us. Remember that nauseating line which the "Liberals" relentlessly spoonfed us with?

Having been in Italy with the Navy, I happened to return to the states in early '46 on a ship carrying musterouts from the Persian Gulf Command. They had been delivering your food, fiber, and war goods to the Russians who spit in their faces as they took delivery.

"TIME IS ON OUR SIDE," THEY SAID

Many of us would have much preferred to stay and fight Russia then, and get it over with, while we could win. In fact, that would have been the only war I could have got my heart in...how nice it would have been to have been fighting FOR something!

So our "boys" came back, most of them, from the jungles and the seas, from the villas and from the hellholes of the world! We had won the war--for our enemy. And obviously, time was not on our side. But "time is on our side," the Administration drummed into us, as our American Communists and fellow-travelers were busy giving the rest of our atomic and military secrets to Russia, which had kidnapped about 2,000 of the best German scientists when the war ended.

Finally, in 1946 Mr. Truman began to question Russia's friendship. Our "containment of Russia" policy got under way. We've contained her, so far, into enslaving only 700 million people--in 15 nations, I believe, at last count.

In our futile efforts to buy friends we've given $120 billion (that's $120 thousand million) to friends and enemies throughout the world--including $12 billion to Russia!

STORE-BOUGHT FRIENDS DON'T STAY BOUGHT

Nations, like individuals, don't stay bought. They keep on raising the price. And once you refuse to pay it, you've made an undying enemy. We need foreign allies who'll join us from freedom--not beggars who compete for our handouts. Our problem is not to be loved but to be respected. Not to be generous but to be invincible. We can depend on no nation risking atomic annihilation in war because of gratitude or friendship for us. Our allies will be those who can't stay out and who think we're the winner.

With "time on our side" Russia has seemingly caught up with us in nuclear development and gone ahead in missiles. Russia reportedly has more and better jet bombers and fighters . . . an army 10 times bigger . . . the ability to destroy U. S. cities with missiles from foreign bases and from submarines 500 miles at sea.

WORK, SAVE, BE STRONG AND BE READY

Time is on. . . the march. What do we do now? We must get to work. End union labor racketeering and monopoly. Kill all unnecessary public spending, kill all government programs which can be postponed, including vast unnecessary spending on the farm program, welfare, and most "Federal Aid" projects ... think more about guns and less about butter... we must stop inflation, balance the budget, reduce the debt so we won't spend ourselves into bankruptcy and oblivion as Lenin predicted. We must get ready for blood, sweat, and tears, even though our leaders have yet to muster the courage to tell us that.

We should disperse key industries to small town throughout the less populated areas of the nation. We should put aside saving the world and concentrate on saving ourselves. We should put aside thoughts of how to save our political party and think only of how to save America. For only if we save America can we save the world. Don't believe people who tell you the budget can't be cut. We could kill at least $20 billion of the current $80 billion budget and get better government and better "defense".

If we are going to save the nation, we must save it on a Tuesday--voting day. But politics is an all-year job. We can't save the nation on any Tuesday unless we work the year around. Never again vote for the lesser to two evils. Vote for somebody you want even if you have to write-in a name. Vote for principles, not personalities. Vote for integrity, not sex-appeal. Vote for what's in the candidate's record, not what's in his ghost-written speeches, for what he does, not what he says.

Third party? Certainly we need a third party. But we need more than that. We need a grassroots uprising. We need a spiritual rebirth.

• • • • • • • • • • •

If we don't stand for something, we will fall for anything.

• • • • • • • • • • •

Precinct Pete

(Reprinted from THE AMERICAN STATESMAN)

• •

Let's see...What were the last words of the Hungarian Freedom fighters....."....the last flames are going out...save us but hurry....God's mercy be with...." Oh hey, here comes Khrushchev and Ike.

* * *

It cost the United States several million dollars to host Khrushchev on his visit --- enough to build a large hospital for crippled children.

* * *

It's impossible to have a balanced budget while unbalanced people are spending the money!

Several million dollars will be spent by both parties at the two big political conventions next summer. Why don't we save all this money and do it by mail!

* * *

A lady down the street thinks Khrushchev is a nice looking man--20 years ago this woman thought Hitler looked "sort of sweet."

* * *

Remember back to the good old days when rich people were conservatives and poor people were liberals?

Committee On Economic Freedom Convenes

Willis E. Stone, in announcing the first national convention of THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM, which will be held in conjunction with THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN FORUM, stated that the proposed 23rd Amendment to the Constitution is rapidly reaching the status of a national issue now that the Legislatures of Texas and Wyoming have passed resolutions calling on the Congress at Washington, D.C. to pass the proposed 23rd Amendment. Passage of this Amendment by Congress would have the effect of forcing the Federal Government to sell all business, professional, financial and industrial enterprises which are now being operated by the Federal Government in violation of the intent and wording of the U.S. Constitution.

"The purpose of this national convention of all those interested in economic freedom," according to Stone, "is not to just have a gabfest, but to bring together all those who are interested in the passage of the 23rd Amendment and to lay out practical means of recruiting support for the 23rd Amendment in every State so that all State Legislators will become committed to the passage of resolutions similar to those passed by Texas and Wyoming."

The program of the first national convention of THE COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM follows:

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23

9:00 a.m. ASSEMBLY
Call to Order.....Convention Chairman FRANK FLICK
Greetings.....National Chairman WILLIS E. STONE
Announcements...Arrangements Chairman ARTHUR CONRAD
Panel Assignments.....Chairman FRANK FLICK

9:20 a.m. PANELS:
Agriculture - Co-Chairmen:
Mr. TOM ANDERSON, Publisher, Nashville, Tenn.
Mr. DAN HANSON, Cattleman, Kaycee, Wyoming.

Health - Co-Chairmen:
ERNEST E. ANTHONY, M.D., Fort Worth, Texas.

Business and Industry - Co-Chairmen:
Mr. J.W. CLISE, Industrialist, Seattle, Washington.
Mr. GEORGE B. FOWLER, Manufacturer, Holyoke, Mass.

Land, Building and Finance - Co-Chairmen:
Mr. PHILIP M. McKENNA, Metallurgist, Latrobe, Pa.
Mr. ROBERT E. NESMITH, Contractor, Houston, Texas.

State Programs - Co-Chairmen:
Mr. A.G. HEINSOHN Jr., Sevierville, Tenn.
Mrs. POLLY RUHTENBERG, Colorado Springs, Colo.

12 Noon LUNCHEON (Tickets at Registration Desk)
Mr. FRANK FLICK, Presiding

Report of Panels (At the Luncheon)
WILLIS E. STONE - Moderator

A Recommended Course of Action
PANEL ON STATE PROGRAMS

IN CONCLUSION
Comments by National Chairman WILLIS E. STONE

2:00 p.m. ADJOURNMENT. Immediately thereafter The Independent American Forum will convene in the same Hotel and same meeting place. KENT COURTNEY, Presiding

It is interesting to note that every geographical region and nine individual States are represented by members of the program.

Willie E. Stone

Willis E. Stone, National Chairman of the National Committee for Economic Freedom, is the author of the proposed 23rd Amendment to the Constitution. His business background is in the field of industrial engineering and advertising. He has lived in Los Angeles since 1923.

In 1948 Willis Stone retired from the active management of his engineering business to devote his full time and study to the cause of human liberty. In 1949 he formed the AMERICAN PROGRESS FOUNDATION, which organization under his dynamic direction made a continuing study of the cost of government. This study included the analysis of all of the activities being performed by the Federal Government which should properly be operated by private enterprise. When it was determined with accounting procedures that the total cost of all of these activities by the Federal Government exceeded the amount of money being collected from the Personal Income Tax, Stone came to the conclusion that the Personal Income Tax could be repealed when the Government was forced to sell all of its holdings of real property, production equipment, and industrial plants which could be more efficiently operated by private business concerns. Out of this study grew the need for the proposed 23rd Amendment.

Early in 1959, Stone organized the National Committee for Economic Freedom to provide the coordinated research, the planning and programming needed to set up campaigns within each State to get the proposed 23rd Amendment approved by the State Legislatures of the various States. In 1959 Wyoming and Texas approved the resolution.

Stone is a director of THE CONGRESS OF FREEDOM and WE, THE PEOPLE. He is also a member of a team of writers and columnists whose columns appear under the title THE AMERICAN WAY. The estimated readership of the more than 300 newspapers which carry this feature is more than 25 million Americans.

Mr. Stone publishes the AMERICAN PROGRESS magazine, a quarterly devoted to the preservation of Constitutional Government. He also publishes a series of single page analytical reports concerning individual federal corporations which are in competition with private industry. Each report shows the yearly and the cumulative losses of each of these Federal activities. This series of reports, called FACT SHEET, are the most maddening piece of literature being produced in the United States today. They irritate the taxpayer who is paying for all of this fantastic and unnecessary spending, and they frighten the bureaucrats who hold down fat, non-productive, parasitic jobs in these Federally-run corporations. FACT SHEET is recommended reading for people with sluggish adrenal glands.



Arthur L. Conrad



Frank Flick

Pictured above is Mr. Arthur L. Conrad, Chicago, Illinois, Chairman of THE AMERICAN HERITAGE FOUNDATION, who is the Publicity Chairman of the first national convention of The National Committee for Economic Freedom.

Mr. Frank Flick, pictured above, is the General Chairman of the first national convention of the NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM. Mr. Flick is an Illinois manufacturer, and a long-time supporter of the movement to repeal the personal income tax.

THE RIGHT TO WORK IS A BASIC RIGHT

(Reprinted from St. Petersburg (Fla.) INDEPENDENT)

Nelson Rockefeller, millionaire Republican governor of New York, is in perfect agreement with George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO combine.

Both agree that the right-to-work idea is wrong in democratic America. The crux of the Meany logic is that unions do better financially when they are able to force workers to belong and make them pay dues. That boils down to might-makes-right.

But Rockefeller's pretzel logic is a bit difficult to understand. Rockefeller is against the right-to-work idea because he says it is undemocratic and not in keeping with the American tradition. According to Rockefeller logic, the idea of personal rights, a choice to join or not to join an organization is un-American in principle and foreign to our noble traditions.

Majority rule justifies all, says Nelson. If that be true, individual freedoms, minority rights and other rights long thought sacred and God-given, mean nothing. And now this Rockefeller thinking starts coming into line with Mr. Meany's reasoning. Might makes right and the devil with the others.

By Mr. Rockefeller's logic, the employes of Rockefeller Center might by majority vote take over Mr. Rockefeller's operation, including the oil wells and other enterprises. One majority religious group, under Rockefeller's curious logic, could suppress any and all other religious groups who were numerically smaller.

Human rights are the basis of the great American tradition. If we lose that concept we have lost everything for which men have died in the long and perilous journey up the hill to democracy. To the man who has but his labor to give, the right to work is basic. It is as important to the worker as owning Standard Oil stock is to Mr. Rockefeller.

When we start chopping away the rights of Americans, our whole concept of America will crumble. It's time someone broke the news to Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Meany.

That Government is best which governs least. The natural process of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain ground.
-- Thomas Jefferson

If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God.
-- George Washington

A. Lincoln's Sound Economic Philosophy

You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.

You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.

You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.

You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.

You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.

You cannot further the brotherhood of men by inciting class hatred.

You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.

You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence.

You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.
-Abraham Lincoln

Independent American Forum - Morrison Hotel, Chicago, Oct. 23

RIGHT-TO-WORK PANEL

"FREEDOM FOR THE WORKING MAN" is the theme of the panel presentation to be made on Friday October 23, 1959 under the auspices of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN FORUM.

Two spokesmen for management and two spokesmen for the free American worker will take part in this discussion. All are connected with THE NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK COMMITTEE with headquarters in Washington, D.C.

William Taylor Harrison

Robert D. Love

J. C. Laney

Wells T. Lovett

Pictured above are the two spokesmen for the American worker. William Taylor Harrison of Alabama and veteran of thirty years of service with the Louisville and Nashville railroad, was a member of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks for twenty years, and for seven years an officer. Harrison took violent exception to the union shop clauses and for this he was expelled from the Brotherhood.

He acted as a spokesman for thousands of railroad workers who objected to being compelled to join a union or lose their jobs. In 1955 Harrison joined the National Right to Work Committee and in January of 1959 was named the President. He is the author of THE TRUTH ABOUT RIGHT TO WORK LAWS.

J. C. Laney is chairman of his local of Railway Engineers representing those on the line of the L and N from Nashville, Tennessee, to Montgomery, Alabama. He helped with the group known as "Railway Employees for Freedom", meeting with groups all over Alabama. This organization published the book "Unionism vs. Goonism - A Declaration to Destroy a Cancer."

The two members of the panel on Right to Work representing management are Mr. Robert D. Love and Mr. Wells T. Lovett.

Robert D. Love is a veteran of the 95th Division in World War II and is a box manufacturer in Wichita, Kansas. He is a director of the Union National Bank, a director of the N.A.M., the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce, and Kansans for the Right to Work. In addition he is active in several charitable and civic organizations.

Wells T. Lovett is a practicing attorney of Owensboro, Kentucky, having graduated from the Michigan College of Law in 1949. He was very active in the passage of the Right to Work law in Kentucky in 1958, making several television appearances, plus many talks before civic and college groups. In May of 1959 Mr. Lovett lectured at the Ohio Personnel Institute, at Ohio State University on the subject "How to Avoid Bargaining Away Management's Rights."

Washinton's way of handling a blunder is to label it "Top Secret."

WHAT IS CAPITALISM?

"What, basically, is capitalism? Shorn of economic jargon, capitalism is a social order in which the individual has the inherent right to own property and capital and the right to pass it on to his children and others. It is a social and economic system where the individual is free to own property, free to work for himself or others, free not to work for the Government, free to choose his employer, his job or his vocation."
-Harold B. Wess in HUMAN EVENTS Article Section

BECAUSE OF CONFEDERATE BLOCKADE

During the War Between the States, when textile specialties were temporarily scarce in the North because of Confederate blockade, the Federal Government set up a little manufacturing plant in Boston to meet the temporary wartime need.

A few years ago when the Hoover Commission was investigating ways to reduce Federal expenses, it found the 90-year-old Boston establishment still operating. Was there a need for its products, or a strong market for them? No, the production of the factory couldn't be sold at realistic prices. It was being bought by the Federal Government for resale at great loss on the market. Then why not cut out the subsidy and close the factory down since it could not pay its own way?

But no, thundered an influential senator from Massachusetts; that would throw 136 people engaged in the uneconomic, taxpayer-subsidized business out of work. So the Hoover Commission, eager to be humane while seeking economies, suggested that nobody be thrown out of work, but that as the individual employes among the 136 died, retired or quit they should not be replaced. By orderly process and without hurting any worker, the plant could in time be closed and a saving to the taxpayers realized. But that didn't suit the powerful Massachusetts senator, either.

Today in Boston, a little textile specialty factory opened during the War Between the States to meet needs forced by Confederate blockade is still operating and the taxpayers are still paying to subsidize the uneconomic production.
(Reprinted from Chattanooga NEWS-FREE PRESS)

History Repeats?

Lee Mortimer, writing in "New York Confidential," says that Taylor Caldwell, noted best seller writer and author of the recently published "The Sound of Thunder", wrote him saying:

"It was horrifying to find, in our researches there, the close parallel between the decline of ancient Rome and the United States.

"Rome had crushing taxation, the exploitation and crushing of the middle class, militarism, so-called leadership of the world, the Pax Romana which was ominously like the United Nations and had the same aims, gangsterism, corrupt law-makers, bribery, public housing and other welfare measures and manufacturers growing rich on war orders due to everlasting crises thought up against the enemy by Roman politicians. It took Rome 400 years to decay. I give America 10 more years."

WELCH AND BUCKLEY TO ADDRESS BANQUET

Robert Welch

Wm. F. Buckley, Jr.

Robert Welch, one of the two speakers at the INDEPENDENT AMERICAN FORUM banquet, is now devoting all of his energies to waking up the American people to the dangers of Communism.

He is the author of THE ROAD TO SALESMANSHIP (1941), MAY GOD FORGIVE US (1952) and THE LIFE OF JOHN BIRCH (1954). Robert Welch publishes a monthly magazine, AMERICAN OPINION, which reviews current events, and appraises contemporary leaders throughout the world. One of the most important features of this magazine is the annual measurement of the growth of Communist influence in the governments of the world, including the United States. This feature is called THE SCOREBOARD and as of June of this year his world-wide board of consultants came up with the conclusion that the United States government was now at least 50% Communist-controlled. This conclusion is based on the actions of our Government and the results in terms of the advance of the Communists both here in the U.S.A. and around the world.

Not content with merely pointing out the dangerousness of the path down which our nation is running pell mell toward economic and social destruction, Robert Welch, has evolved a positive program for recovery of our national independence and our individual liberty. "A Counterattack Against Collectivism" is the title of his talk at the INDEPENDENT AMERICAN FORUM banquet!

Welch is a former regional vice-president of the National Association of Manufacturers, and for many years was Vice President in charge of sales and advertising of the James O. Welch Company, the nationally famous candy manufacturer.

He has lived in Belmont, Massachusetts, for the past 20 years, having been born in North Carolina and educated at the University of North Carolina, The U.S. Naval Academy, and Harvard Law School.
harvard Law School. He states that he has one wife, two sons, a Golden Retriever dog, and fourteen golf clubs--none of which he understands.

The INDEPENDENT AMERICAN FORUM considers itself most fortunate to be able to present Robert Welch as one of the two speakers at the banquet on Friday night, October 23rd, at the Morrison Hotel in Chicago!

Mr. Wm. F. Buckley, Jr. will be one of the two speakers at the INDEPENDENT AMERICAN FORUM banquet, in the Constitution Room of the Morrison Hotel in Chicago on Friday October 23rd. The Independent American Forum and banquet is our way of celebrating United States Day.

When asked what the title of his talk would be, he said that he did not usually give titles. But the age of conformity has us surrounded and so Mr. Buckley agreed, after some pressure, to allow a title to be given to his talk: UP FROM LIBERALISM. Incidentaly that is the title of his new book. You see how this capitalist system works!

Mr. Buckley, editor of NATIONAL REVIEW, first provoked public attention by his best-selling book, God and Man at Yale, published in 1951. In it Mr. Buckley raised the urgent and searching question, What are today's students being taught? The book was probably the most widely reviewed book of the year, and the same was true of his second best-seller, McCarthy and His Enemies, which he co-authored, with Mr. L. Brent Bozell, in 1954. McCarthy and His Enemies was a scholarly examination of loyalty and security practices in Washington, and the controversy over Senator McCarthy that rocked the nation.

As editor of NATIONAL REVIEW, Mr. Buckley has led a team of the greatest conservative writers in America, including Whittaker Chambers, John Chamberlain, James Burnham, Willmoore Kendall, Max Eastman, John Dos Passos, Frank Meyer, and Brent Bozell. The magazine has sought to revitalize the conservative faith, and in the three years of its existence has risen to the circulation level of its influential left-wing counterpart, The New Republic.

Mr. Buckley is a well-known and challenging speaker and debater who has lectured widely over the United States, and on television and radio programs. He has spoken at The National War College, at Yale, Harvard, Princeton, Columbia, Cornell, New York University, the Universities of South Carolina, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Indiana, at the Commonwealth Club of California, and before more than a hundred other colleges and organizations.

Born in New York in 1925, Mr. Buckley spent years studying in England and France. He served in the Army during World War II, and entered Yale in 1946, where he was chairman of the college paper. He graduated from Yale, with honors, in 1950.

YOUR TAX DOLLARS ARE BEING WASTED AT HOME AND ABROAD

HERE IS HOW YOUR MONEY IS BEING WASTED IN THE U.S.:

The Federal Government, through its various bureaus, corporations, facilities, and activities, competes with big and small industry in the following areas:

Banking, Insurance, Manufacturing, Subsidies, Hotels, Railroads, Transportation, Utilities, International Cartels, etc.

The direct and indirect losses which can be eliminated by selling all of these functions and Government corporations to private enterprise, amount to ..... $39.7 Billion *

HERE IS HOW YOUR MONEY IS WASTED IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

(1) Supporting Communist and Socialist Governments overseas.
(2) Paying off the national debts of foreign governments.
(3) Helping foreign governments to reduce taxes!
(4) Building cities, schools, dams, roads for foreign governments all over the world.
(5) Other Foreign Aid Giveaway programs to a total of 76 countries.

This unconstitutional use of your hard-earned tax dollars in various programs of Foreign Aid each year totals approximately ..... $5.0 Billion *

TOTAL UNNECESSARY FEDERAL SPENDING FOR 1959 ..... $44.7 Billion

Note: This total of $44.7 billion could be saved each year without taking any money from National Defense and other necessary functions of our Federal Government.

The total estimated income taxes for 1959 amount to approximately ..... $36.9 Billion *

Thus you see that the FEDERAL PERSONAL INCOME TAX COULD BE REPEALED, and there would still be a surplus of ..... $7.8 Billion * which could be applied each year to the National Debt and still further reduce the cost of government.

(All figures in this tabulation are based on a 12-year study of the Hoover Commission Reports made by the National Committee for Economic Freedom.)

* *See Congressional Record - April 14, 1959 - Page A3042*

EXAMPLE OF A PROFITABLE SALE OF A GOVERNMENT CORPORATION

In 1956 the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission reported the successful sale of 27 rubber producing plants. Page 5 of the report summarizes the results of selling these formerly Government-owned plants as follows:

Total realized from Disposal Program including sales of all plants and tank cars $284,848,000
Net book value of all assets $127,617,000
Accumulated DEficit during period of Government operation $134,693,000
Total Government investment in rubber plants $262,310,000
Total profit on sale of a Government corporation to private enterprise ..... $ 22,538,000

The Federal Government no longer loses money each year operating these rubber producing plants. The plants, now in the hands of private enterprise, earn money for their investors, and pay taxes to the Federal, State and local governments.

Our income tax and big government are Siamese Twins. One grabs your money, the other throws it away.

A Prophecy Come True!

By Sen. Harry Byrd's father, Richard E. Byrd, Speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates, on March 3, 1910

"It (the 16th or income tax Amendment) means that the state must give up a legitimate and long established source of revenue and yield it to the federal government.

"It means that the state actually invites the federal government to invade its territory, to oust its jurisdiction and to establish federal dominion within the innermost citadel of reserved rights of the Commonwealth.

"This amendment will do what even the 14th (due process) and 15th (Voting) amendments did not do--it will extend the federal power so as to reach the citizen in the ordinary business of life. A hand from Washington will be stretched out and placed upon every man's business; the eye of a federal inspector will be in every man's counting house.

"The law will of necessity have inquisitorial features, it will provide penalties. It will create a complicated machinery.

"Under it, business men will be hauled into courts distant from their homes.

"Heavy fines imposed by distant and unfamiliar tribunals will constantly menace the taxpayer.

"An army of federal inspectors, spies and detectives will descend upon the state. They will compel men of business to show their books and disclose the secrets of their affairs. They will dictate forms of bookkeeping. They will require statements and affidavits. On the one hand the inspector can blackmail the taxpayer and on the other, he can profit by selling his secret to his competitor.

"When the federal government gets a strangle hold on the individual business man, state lines will exist nowhere but on the maps. Its agents will everywhere supervise the commercial life of the state . . . I am not willing by any voluntary act to give up revenue which the State of Virginia herself needs, nor to surrender that measure of states' rights which was, and the construction of the federal courts have permitted to remain."

VIRGINIA DID NOT RATIFY THE 16th AMENDMENT!

NEW PARTY DAY ACTIVITIES - - - - MORRISON HOTEL, CHICAGO, OCTOBER 24

BRACKEN LEE TO ADDRESS NEW PARTY RALLY

As National Chairman of FOR AMERICA, Governor Lee has travelled throughout the United States for the past three years making public addresses before Conservative groups in almost every State in the Union. His continued fight for honesty, efficiency and economy in government has impressed thousands of Conservative leaders who agree that J. Bracken Lee is one of the most tireless fighters for Constitutional government in America.

Bracken Lee knows the pulse of these United States; he knows that the people are tired of having the eastern internationalists dictate the nominee of both the Democrat and Republican Parties.

We believe that the audience at the New Party Rally will be inspired by the words of J. Bracken Lee when he issues his CHALLENGE TO PATRIOTS.

(See photo on page 1)

Third Party Predicted By South Carolinian

MANASSAS.

—A Southern Congressman, in a fighting speech at the site of the First Battle of Manassas, today predicted a Third Party candidate will give Americans an opportunity to vote for "constitutional government" in the 1960 Presidential election.

Representative Dorn, Democrat of South Carolina, declared: "A movement is underway to give you a political choice in 1960."

Representative Dorn, speaking at a ceremony commemorating the 98th anniversary of the Confederate victory at Manassas, said candidates "will be offered within and possibly without the Democratic and Republican parties who will have the courage to support the Constitution as written . . ."

Stating that there are no real issues between the "many" political aspirants to the presidency," he said the 1960 election "might well be our last opportunity to return sanity to our Government . . . to oppose with united effort this latest civil rights legislation, Federal aid to education, this stupendous budget and Federal encroachment."

Tom Anderson, Luncheon Speaker

Tom Anderson

About Tom Anderson, it has been said, "to Tom Anderson ...right is right and wrong is wrong and any compromise between the two is cowardice."

Tom Anderson is the main speaker at the luncheon on New Party Day. He will have an interesting and challenging talk, interesting because here is a man who will have just returned from a long trip of inspection behind the Iron Curtain. As editor and publisher of FARM AND RANCH he has become nationally famous for his hard hitting editorials called "Straight Talk". These editorials are reprinted regularly in 375 newspapers throughout the country, during the last year more than 80,000 reprints of his editorials have been requested by readers throughout America.

Tom Anderson is a native of Tennessee and a graduate of Vanderbilt University. He served as a Naval Officer during World War II.

He has been associated with farm publications since 1945. He purchased the ARKANSAS FARMER in 1945, established the MISSISSIPPI FARMER in 1953, established the GEORGIA FARMER in 1956. Late in 1953 Tom Anderson became editor and publisher of FARM AND RANCH, a regional farm magazine serving 1,300,000 readers in states from Virginia to Arizona.

This then is Tom Anderson, crusader, idealist, libertarian, and patriot. He has called for a new political party in his editorials. You can be sure of a thrilling experience when you hear him speak at the NEW PARTY luncheon on Saturday October 24th at the Morrison Hotel in Chicago.

DO YOU KNOW?--That as of January 1, 1959, the federal government had no less than 2,543 persons on the payroll just to run the Bureau of the Public Debt!

Political Action Seminar

David Molthrop

One of the co-chairmen of the Political Action Seminar being held during the afternoon of New Party Rally Day is David M. Molthrop. Mr. Molthrop's background includes effective "grass-roots" political activity which has resulted in the defeat at the ballot box of various proposals of the CIO-AFL. So effective has his work been in the passage of Right-To-Work legislation in various States, that the CIO has seen fit to write a booklet which outlines how to fight not only the Right-to-Work proposal but also warning labor leaders throughout the nation that David M. Molthrop is a dangerous adversary in a political campaign.

Mr. Molthrop is a native of Chicago, Illinois, and is executive secretary of THE COMMITTEE ON STATE SOVEREIGNTY with headquarters in Washington, D.C. He has participated in political campaigns on behalf of taxpayer groups, in favor of the right-to-work laws, presenting industry's point of view on the so-called guaranteed annual wage in Ohio, Kansas, Nevada, and Michigan.

He provided valuable information to the Senate Rackets Committee and is always ready to go to work on behalf of legislation protecting the taxpayer.

His experience in promoting the Conservative viewpoint at the "grass roots" level will be of great value to all those participating in the discussions at the Political Action Seminar on Saturday, October 24th, at the Morrison Hotel.

Medford Evans

Dr. Medford Evans will be a co-chairman of the Political Action Seminar. Dr. Evans is a professor of History and until recently he was teaching at Northwestern State College at Natchitoches, Louisiana. Several months ago he engaged in a debate at Harvard in which he took a position that opposed the naming of Dr. Julius Robert Oppenheimer to a chair of Ethics and Morals at Harvard. It is the belief of many that this was the reason that Dr. Evans was fired from this state of Louisiana-operated University. Medford Evans worked closely with Admiral Lewis Strauss in exposing the fact that the associates of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer were of such pro-Communist leanings that Oppenheimer himself was declared a security risk and fired from the Atomic Energy Commission.

Dr. Evans is the author of a famous book, THE SECRET WAR FOR THE "A" BOMB, which is in great demand by the Communists only because they are trying to suppress it and remove it from libraries. It should be read by every Conservative who considers himself an anti-Communist!

Dr. Evans is a practical politician and is one of the spark plugs of the States Rights Party of Louisiana where he is Chairman of the Organization and Strategy Committee. He was formerly Editor-in-Chief of FACTS FORUM magazine.

Dr. Evans will also give a talk on THE SOUTHERN POSITION at the Political Action Seminar.

PAUL BUTLER MOVES TO OUST SOUTH

(Reprinted from THE STATE of Columbia, S.C.)

There seems little question but that Paul Butler emerged from the recent meeting of the National Democratic Executive Committee in a stronger position than before--despite one abortive attempt to remove the controversial Indianan as National Chairman.

THE STATE'S Washington correspondent reports that Butler is expected to use the time between now and the 1960 nominating convention to solidify his leadership of the party--or rather his control over the nominating convention machinery. Butler is expected to use his power and influence to block the aspirations of Texas' Lyndon Johnson, majority leader of the Senate.

Butler, fanatically anti-South, has long been at odds with the Rayburn-Johnson leadership. He now threatens to attempt ousting Rayburn as permanent chairman of the convention, and House Majority Leader John McCormack of Massachusetts as chairman of the convention platform committee. These would be replaced with Butler men, as would the chairman of the convention credentials committee, a position now held by Cal Rawlins of Utah.

Should Butler and his colleagues gain this much control over the convention, they would greatly increase their chances of hand-picking the 1960 nominee. Any man "acceptable" to the Butler faction might be absolutely anathema to Southern Democrats. More and more it looks as if the Democrats are preparing for a real intra-party blowup next summer.

The Great Spender

Did you know that during the last full five years of the Truman administration (1948-1952) the Treasury Department collected $247 billion dollars and REDUCED the national debt by $3 1/2 billion?

Did you also know that during the first five years of the Eisenhower administration (1953-1957) no less than $365 billion was collected -- BUT THE NATIONAL DEBT INCREASED $9 BILLION?

Yet, this is the same Eisenhower, who, on Oct. 16, 1952, said: "We will stop wild spending of your money and prevent these recurring national deficits from putting the pressure on your money to go down and down. I do promise, through prudent handling of government expenditures, through the elimination of the national deficit, through halting inflation and through eventual lowering of taxes, to preserve for the people of the United States these security gains. I do not believe these gains should be secretly whittled away by creeping inflation. Our first task must be to go after waste and extravagance. By this means, we will be able, first to eliminate the deficit and then to lower taxes."

WE CHALLENGE OUR READERS TO SHOW WHERE PRESIDENT EISENHOWER HAS KEPT ANY OF THESE CAMPAIGN PROMISES.

(Reprinted from Manchester (N.H.) UNION LEADER)

ATTENTION!

CIVIC CLUBS, NEW PARTIES
PATRIOTIC ORGANIZATIONS – STATES RIGHTERS
POLITICAL CLUBS
CITIZENS COUNCILS
UP TO 100 FREE COPIES
OF THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN
AVAILABLE TO YOU WRITE US YOUR NEEDS

PARTICIPATION FORM

IF YOU PLAN TO ATTEND THE NEW PARTY meetings, please fill out this coupon and mail to us immediately so that we may inform the Morrison Hotel how many to expect for the NEW PARTY RALLY and the banquet and luncheons.

Mail to: THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN Newspaper, P. O. Box 4223, New Orleans, La.

PLEASE DO NOT SEND MONEY FOR BANQUET OR REGISTRATION FEES. PAY ON ARRIVAL IN CHICAGO.

I plan to attend . . . (Please indicate your participation by marking appropriate boxes)

(1) Registration fee - INDEPENDENT AMERICAN FORUM (Fri. Oct. 23 and Sat. Oct. 24... Luncheons and banquet extra). . . . . $3.00 ☐

(2) COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM Luncheon - Friday Oct. 23, Willis Stone, Chairman. . .$5.00 ☐

(3) INDEPENDENT AMERICAN FORUM BANQUET - Friday night, Oct. 23. Speakers: Robert Welch and William F. Buckley, Jr. . . . . $7.00 ☐

(4) NEW PARTY LUNCHEON - Saturday, Oct. 24. Speaker: Tom Anderson . . . . . $5.00 ☐

(5) NEW PARTY RALLY - Saturday night, Oct. 24. Speakers: Dan Smoot and J. Bracken Lee. . . . . (FREE) ☐

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____

Please send me _____ copies of these invitation Folders (free) for my friends.

NOTE: Make reservations for your hotel room direct with the Morrison Hotel, Chicago.

Dr. R. P. Oliver To Speak

Revilo P. Oliver

It is not often that a professor of Classics at a State University has the courage to speak out against the International Communist Conspiracy and it is a rare phenomenon indeed when that same individual will recommend specific political action and participate in a New Party Rally. But that is the case of Dr. Revilo Pendleton Oliver of the University of Illinois!

If our daily newspapers had not in large part already sold out to the Communist Conspiracy his speeches attacking that conspiracy would make headlines across the nation.

Dr. Oliver is a scholar of international reputation, having written articles in four languages which have been published in twelve learned periodicals in the U.S. and Europe.

During World War II, he was director of research in a secret agency of the War Department for which he was cited for outstanding service to his country. In this position his attention was first called to the magnitude of the Communist penetration in the U.S. To expose this conspiracy he has written many book reviews and articles for NATIONAL REVIEW, AMERICAN PROGRESS, CHRISTIAN ECONOMICS, AMERICAN OPINION, FREE ENTERPRISE, and NATION'S BUSINESS.

At 10 A.M. on October 24th Revilo Oliver will speak out on the fact that both political parties refuse to fight the Communist Conspiracy and that a new political party is needed to save this country.

The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who, in a period of moral crisis, maintain their neutrality.

....Dante

WANTED: An Independent Candidate

Only if there is an INDEPENDENT CONSERVATIVE CANDIDATE in 1960 will Conservative voters of the North, South, East and West have a real choice. Otherwise, it will be the same old "choice" between the candidate of Socialist Party "A" (formerly the Democrat Party) and Socialist Party "B" (formerly the Republican Party.)

Five Southern States have already made legal preparation to place Independent Electors on the ballot in 1960. These presidential electors would be independent of both the Democrat and the Republican parties.

However, a Southern "bolt" from the Northern Liberal-dominated Democrat Party would be futile indeed if the South is all alone in this gesture of political independence.

Likewise, a Northern Conservative movement to support an INDEPENDENT CONSERVATIVE for President would be meaningless if the North stood alone.

Only if the Conservatives of the North, South, East and West stand side by side, is a Conservative victory possible.

But first we must have an INDEPENDENT CONSERVATIVE CANDIDATE for President.

When enthusiasm for the INDEPENDENT PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE begins to gain momentum - when the Conservatives throughout the nation begin to rally behind this INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE....the South's Independent Electors, who are Conservatives (otherwise they would not be Independent Electors!) will feel the "grass roots" pressure to join forces with the Independent Presidential Candidate.

In this way, the Southern Independent Electors who previously had lacked a candidate,..who previously were trying to appeal to the voters in their community to blindly vote for them as Independent Electors....would have a candidate who could capture the public's imagination and enthusiasm and thereby, assure a Southern victory of all Independent Electors!

Northern and Western Conservatives operating through new party organizations in the various States, and/or through a system of Independent Electors, could join hands with Southern Independent Electors and thereby form a base of real political power.

It is in this situation that a NEW, CONSERVATIVE POLITICAL PARTY COULD BE BORN. It would be a truly national party.

No longer would the National Democratic party be able to regard the South as a necessary but bothersome caudal appendage. No longer would the truly Conservative voters throughout the country consider that the Republican Party was their only hope, even when its performance has been nothing but a carbon copy of the International Socialism and the Bureaucratic Centralism as practiced by the Democratic Party since 1933.

The International Socialists of the present Republican party and the Labor Socialists of the present Democratic party, finding themselves in two minority Socialist parties, would for political self-preservation, then meld into one Liberal-Socialist Party.

In this way, the two-party system...Liberal party vs. the Conservative party....would be restored to the U.S.

SUPPORT AN INDEPENDENT PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

Only if Conservatives throughout this nation work and support an Independent Presidential Candidate - and only if Southern Conservatives "see the light" and join their great strength of the Independent Elector Plan in support of the CONSERVATIVE INDEPENDENT PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE is a Conservative victory in this nation possible in 1960.

The Farm Program Is Sick - - Sick

"Today's burdensome surpluses with their fantastic storage costs are symptoms of a sick farm program which has infected the business of agriculture with the disease of Federal aid and control."

The above words were spoken by a man considered by many to be one of the nation's leading experts on the farm problem, Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau.

The Farm Bureau Federation represents 1.6 million farm families throughout the nation and speaks for the majority of its members as attested to by frequent polls conducted by the Farm Bureau.

Mr. Shuman then went on to point out that the farmers would be vastly better off if the Government would permit them to use the free market place to supply consumer needs because Government subsidy programs serve neither the interests of the consumer or the farmer.

The various farm subsidy programs have wasted billions of dollars paying farmers to grow and not to grow certain crops. However, there are other so-called farm programs costing vast sums, that the farmer didn't get one cent of.

For instance, did you know that during the 11 months ending May 31, according to the Commodity Credit Corporation, carrying charges alone on crops amounted to $495 million, interest amounted to $145 million and "general overhead" cost $39.3 million. This total of $679.3 million, paid for by taxpayers' dollars, didn't help the farmer; it merely enriched the ever - increasing swarm of Bureaucrats that now infest almost every segment of American production.

'Good Democrat'

Labor Boss Walter Reuther has put the radical accolade on Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York. "I think he would make a good Democrat," Reuther said.

Among the present bosses of the Democratic Party, Reuther is a dominat figure. He speaks with authority on what nowadays constitutes "a good Democrat." Since Mr. Rockefeller is ranked as a powerful contender for the G.O.P. nomination, the "one-party system", seems to be coming every closer in the United States

INDEPENDENT FARMERS PANEL Chairman Says New Party Needed

Clifford, Simpson, of Mount Vernon, Ohio, chairman of the panel discussion on the farm problem which will be presented on New Party Day at 9 A.M. says that most of the members of the Independent Farmers can see no hope of obtaining freedom for the farmer from either of the old political parties.

Other members of the panel discussion which will take place at the Morrison Hotel on Saturday, October 24th include, Ethan Stangland of Albion, Indiana, who is chairman of the INDEPENDENT FARMERS OF INDIANA; Vincent Richmond of Marcellus, Michigan; Ralph Shinabery of Hudson, Michigan; and John Donaldson of New London, Ohio.

Other members of the panel will include Walter Warrington of Tetonia, Ohio and Frank Saffell, of North Georgetwon, Ohio.

Other speakers may be added to this panel of farmers who are looking to the formation of a new political party dedicated to Constitutional Government, and the free market to set the farm free from quotas, controls, and subsidies.

Clifford J. Simpson

Clifford J. Simpson, Mount Vernon, Ohio, is Vice-Chairman of the Independent Farmers of Ohio. Simpson will be chairman of the panel on Freedom for the Farmer which will be presented at 9 A.M. Saturday, October 24th at the Morrison Hotel, in Chicago.

His personal story is one of rugged old-fashioned American determination resulting in individual success in his chosen field. In a one-room school house in Howard Twonship, Ohio, he learned to hold in high esteem the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. For 14 years following his graduation from high school he worked as a hired hand on other men's farms. He married and started farming for himself in 1942. Even while a hired hand he voiced his protest against the recognition of Soviet Russia and he fought the Communist-style regulation of the farmer which was inaugurated under F.D.R.

In 1953 the Republican Administration renewed Soviet-type controls over American farmers. Mr. Simpson not only has been personally fighting these un-American regulations but he has sparked a general fight for freedom for the American farmer by helping to organize the Independent Farmers of Ohio. Simpson, a full-time dirt farmer, has also spent his energy in helping some 20 other States to establish Independent Farmer organizations!

Since 1954 the Federal Government has sued Simpson four times for allegedly planting more wheat than the regulations called for. In 1958, the Government seized his bank account without benefit of trial by jury and removed almost $300.00 which was claimed to be the fine assesed for overplanting wheat!

The federals have two more judgements against Simpson at the present time and another case is pending in court. Simpson says, "All of these charges are trumped up and based on fabricated lies."

The Independent American newspaper believes that the Federals will harass anyone or or any movement that threatens the established bureaucracy which is carrying out a preconceived plan to Socialize America through indirect controls and then Communize this nation through direct seizure of all land and wealth-producing properties in the United States.

John Donaldson

John Donaldson of New London, Ohio, has opposed the Agriculture Department's control over the growing of wheat since their inception in 1953. He has contested two wheat penalty cases through the Federal Court of Appeals.

Farmer Donaldson operates his farm which was handed directly down to him by his pioneer ancestors who obtained the land under the Firelands grants from the State of Connecticut for losses that were sustained by farms which were ravaged by the British during the American War for Independence from England.

As a member of the Independent Farmers of Ohio, Donaldson will be a member of the panel discussing the farm problem on Saturday, October 24th at the Morrison Hotel in Chicago.



Ethan Stangland

Ethan Stangland, Albion, Indiana, is President of the Independent Farmers of Indiana, Inc., and he is also Chairman of the National Council of Farmers for America.

Stangland has always been opposed to Federal interference with the private property of the American farmer. For the last five years he has been vigorously fighting to regain the right to own and operate his farm as a free man in free enterprise.

Stangland gained nation-wide attention when the Federal Government seized his tractors, just before hay harvesting time. The power-crazed bureaucrats in the Agriculture Department seized these tractors and sold them at auction in order to collect fines that had been imposed by the Agriculture Department because Stangland allegedly planted more wheat than the overlords of Agriculture had said that Stangland should plant.

Stangland is convinced that the hope of freedom for the farmer and the nation is in the establishment of a new political party which will run a candidate who is pledged to restore freedom to the American farmer and every other sector of the economy as was intended by the framers of the U.S. Constitution.

Ralph A. Shinabery

Ralph A. Shinabery, President of the Independent Farmers of Michigan, and known throughout the United States as dean of the Independent Farmer movement, has always opposed controls over the nation's farmers.

In 1954 he sued the Federal Government to see if they could tell him how to run his farm. He has had numerous court battles testing the unfair, un-American controls exercised by the Agriculture Department over the American farmer.

Farmer Shinabery says, "When I was fighting in the first World War, I was told that I was fighting for the preservation of Freedom, and I have been fighting for the preservation and restoration of freedom to the American farmer ever since."

Time to Pay for Prodigality

It cannot be an easy decision for the President to make public acknowledgement that the Government of the United States is in financial straits.

For one thing, such an acknowledgement must partake of the nature of a confession by those who make it; it must also carry implications of blame for many past errors by others. Thus it would be bound to raise a tremendous political furor.

For another, there is the sheer difficulty of explaining the problem, of relating the Government's fiscal difficulties, seemingly so remote, to the work-a-day lives of the people. It would require considerable skill to do this with the right sense of proportion.

And finally there is the very real fear that dramatic gestures might carry such a tone of desperateness as to make matters worse. It is this that pinions the President and those about him upon the horns of a dilemma; they may need dramatic gestures to give a sense of urgency to action, but the same gestures could conceivably turn a sense of urgency into one of panic.

So we can understand the doubts and hesitation over the plan, now being discussed within the Administration, to call a special session of Congress to deal with pressing fiscal problems and to have the President personally explain to the country, by television and radio, the dimensions of that problem.

Yet it seems to us that the time has come for something to dramatize the Government's fiscal plight. The risks involved, we think, are far outweighed by what is to be won.

The fiscal problem as viewed by the men who manage the Government's money, and whose views are reported elsewhere in this newspaper, is serious, beyond doubt. But it is not calamitous, much less hopeless—if the right actions are taken promptly. And we have not lost our conviction that the people of the United States will support the right actions, once they are told the truth plainly and honestly.

That truth, in its simplest form, is that time has caught up with a prodigal country. For more than a decade this country has spent money like the proverbial drunken sailor. We have poured out billions to make life more pleasant for farmers, to pay handsome rewards to veterans, to give ourselves a luxury of houses and roads and any sort of "welfare" that came happily to mind. We have poured many billions of hard-earned money all over the globe.

And we have done all this with a blatant disregard of the deficit the billions accrued in our accounts. Many politicians led us on by dangling before us all the wonderful things we could buy with these billions. Worse, many learned economists reassured us that all those deficits were of no consequence; the supply of money was endless. Still worse, we as a people believed all this, too intoxicated to remember that even the richest purse is not bottomless.

Well, now the men who manage the money see that the bottom is not far away. The "technical" problem that grabs the headlines—the rising interest rates for borrowed money—is merely a warning sign of what lies beneath. It says that the barrel is running dry not only for the Treasury of the United States but for everybody.

But a warning is also an opportunity. Here the opportunity is time to choose between two paths. One is to choose inflation; not the "modest" inflation we have heard so much about but inflation in mammoth doses. The other is to choose to put our house in order.

This means, first of all, to pay the price of our past prodigality. Congress must give the Government the legal authority to shoulder long-term debts regardless of the cost, in interest rates, of that debt; the managers must have the tools to manage with. But it means most of all that we must stop our prodigal spending.

Neither the President, the Secretary of the Treasury nor anyone else need suppose that it is any secret to the informed people of the world that the United States has come to this choice. Not to speak of it, not to say frankly what must be done, will only hide it a little longer from the great body of the citizens.

So we think it is far better to speak plainly and act boldly. This country has had more than a decade of dancing a feverish spending tune.

(Reprinted from the WALL STREET JOURNAL)

The Visit

In this Summer of surfeit and contentment, a generally unreflective American people cannot be expected to rebel at today's headlines. Khrushchev has arrived, they read, with a passing nod or frown. And what else is new? By and large, as in the past, those caught in a decisive moment miss its significance. Future historians will not be so blind. Plotting the course of America's destiny, they may well conclude that September 15, 1959, was the turning-point of a troubled century, a day in which the world changed. This was the day that Western civilization clasped hands with barbarism. This was the day, for want of vision and will, that America conferred the priceless gift of legitimacy on a Revolution sworn to destroy all we profess to believe.

Let us have plain speech: A generation ago, the cause of freedom was not so cheaply held. In 1939, the American people would not have remained docile and indifferent in the face of a visit by Hitler to President Roosevelt. Such a confrontation, in the land of the free, would have been properly rejected as outrageous mockery of the moral truths underlying the American way of life. Today, drugged by relativism, betrayed by sophistry, the American people are not capable of apprehending their moral bankruptcy.

The Cold War is not a conflict of competing materialisms. It is not simply a race to achieve the largest Gross National Product. The Cold War, at bottom, is a conflict of utterly opposite visions of man and his role on earth. Or, that is what the Cold War was, in the not-so-distant days when a cry of "liberation" could rally American sympathy for the victims of communism. Hungary showed the shallowness of our sympathy. Today's welcome of Khrushchev in Washington marks America's moral abdication.

In an age of skepticism, Khrushchev is a true believer, a man whose every word and gesture is committed to an emerging ideal, not to a present fulfillment. President Eisenhower, in contrast, is a man who publicly has confessed inability to argue convincingly the cause of freedom with Soviet Marshal Zhukov. The President, perfectly symbolizing the people he leads, is a genial extrovert intensely concerned with the here and now. His ideals are shining but vague, while those of his Bolshevik guest are concrete and precise.

America, it is said, lacks a sustaining ideology, a counterpart of the totalitarian worship of the state. True, an American cannot answer instantly questions that pose no difficulty to the Communist's closed mind. But there is an innate understanding of America's meaning. In the past, American agreement on means and ends has been rooted in individual freedom and moral conviction. Man is endowed, by his Creator with certain inalienable rights, we said, thus enobling man and affirming belief in a higher law. Today, the American consensus is material, not spiritual; and collectivism, rather than individualism, is the faith of our society.

Given this shallow faith and a set of material values, the American people are disarmed by an enemy whose faith is deeper and whose materialism is more ruthlessly efficient. Driven by nothing more noble than the instinct of survival, a fearful people do not hesitate to shift their ground to conciliate a powerful enemy. Though our greatness rises from the antithesis of communism, we meet today in an arena fashioned by the Communists, there to win—if the truth be spoken—yet a few moments more of ease and security. Time, however, is impartial; it serves only him who uses it.

The Communists, very plainly, are using time; their faith is dynamic, ours, defensive. Today, the American Revolution seeks accommodation with the Soviet Revolution, though it is obvious that "peace" will be dictated by the onrushing, not the retreating, vision of the future. Perhaps the unyielding arrogance of Khrushchev, who already has given his humiliating terms for "co-existence," will awaken the American people to their peril. Perhaps the barbarian will not be able to conceal his lust for our treasure and our freedom. It is necessary to hope, but only the revival of a weakened faith, the exorcising of the Communist heresy within us, will make hope a reality.

(Reprinted from the Richmond (Va.,) NEWS LEADER)

The 'Real' Khrushchev

(Reprinted from Chattanooga NEWS-FREE PRESS)

The American people are gagging over Khrushchev's "sweetness" as he proclaimed a love for peace and cooperation and "self-determination" and disarmament--and all the other things he currently is violating. But on September 16, they got a look at the "real" Khrushchev.

Following Khrushchev's labored and hypocritical speech at the National Press Club in Washington, questions were submitted to him.

This one stung him. In effect he was asked: Where was Khrushchev when Stalin was committing all those crimes for which Khrushchev, Stalin's protege, later found it expedient to attack Stalin in a speech to a Communist congress? Showing anger, Khrushchev said he regarded the question as a provocation, muttered about "lies" and "malicious rumors"--and never did answer the question.

Another question concerned Hungary, whose people called for freedom under self-determination and without force but were murdered in the streets and hauled away by the thousands to Russian concentration camps on order of the now sweet-talking Khrushchev. How does he justify his sending the Russian army into Hungary?

Again Khrushchev refused to answer. He merely retorted: "The question of Hungary has stuck in some people's throat like a dead rat--they feel it is unpleasant and yet cannot spit it out."

Hungary and the other crimes of Khrushchev and his cohorts (both before and since) indeed stick in the throats, hearts and minds of free people everywhere--the solid and sordid facts making far stronger impression than Khrushchev's oily smiling, coy, enticing, lying words.

RESUME THE ATOM TESTS

In a gesture intended to win friends and influence people, the United States announced it would suspend all tests of nuclear weapons for a period of one year. The year is up Oct. 31, and the folly of the gesture is becoming apparent.

For now if the United States resumes testing it will lose more friends than it made by banning the tests. If it doesn't resume testing, it may wake up one day to find itself far outstripped by Russia in the atomic race. The U.S. has, in effect, gotten into a position of an international ban on tests without any enforcement machinery. That is the very thing this country has tried to avoid ever since the Baruch plan was presented to the United Nations more than a decade ago.

To be sure, the Russians also announced they would suspend their nuclear tests. They said they were suspending their program on March 31, 1958, but the United States government says the Soviets have exploded nuclear devices since then. Scientists also have learned, since the Russian and American suspensions, that atomic tests can be made underground without any possibility of being detected by another country. Thus the whole argument of a unilateral test suspension has been destroyed.

It can no longer be proposed that the U.S. should suspend tests and keep them suspended as long as the Russians did likewise. That proposal assumed we would know as soon as the Russians set off an atomic blast. Scientists now say we won't. During the last 10 months, while the U.S. has given up its test program, Russia could have set off scores of atomic tests in caves in the Ural Mountains, and the U.S. would never have known about them.

The United States set Oct. 31 as the cut-off date for nuclear tests because the Geneva conference on banning atomic weapons started Oct. 31, 1958. It has been a supreme exercise in futility. Even in the current relaxation of American-Soviet tensions, Soviet Delegate Tsarapkin has made not the slightest concession that could lead to an inspection system which would offer a basis for ending nuclear tests. The sterile Geneva conference has gone on endlessly, with the Soviets repeatedly calling for a permanent end to nuclear tests but not agreeing to the inspections that would make such a suspension of tests anything but an open invitation to national suicide on the part of the United States.

In the next few months, perhaps in the next few days, there will be a fourth member of the nuclear club. France is ready to explode its own atomic device over the Sahara Desert, and President De Gaulle would dearly love to pull the test off before he meets with President Eisenhower the end of this month. No doubt the French will then be invited to join the Geneva conference on limiting atomic tests. Obviously the three current conferees—Britain, Russia and the United States—won't ban further tests unless France does.

The United States already has gone farther than prudence dictates in giving up tests on a weapon in which she had acknowledged superiority. The Soviets have made no reciprocal gesture by giving up tests of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The United States should now make it clear, by every means at its command, that it will resume testing nuclear weapons on Nov. 1, the day after its voluntary year of abnegation comes to an end. Only if the Soviet Union in the meantime agrees to negotiate a truly effective inspection system should the U.S. risk its future by failing to further develop and refine the weapon that now provides the free world with its shield against Soviet aggression.

(Reprinted from INDIANAPOLIS STAR)

(Editor's note: Acting on the spur-of-the moment, and without the advice of Pentagon and Atomic Energy Commission officials, President Eisenhower has just ordered a two-month extension of the U. S. ban on nuclear weapons testing. This means that the U. S. binds itself not to resume atom testing until December 31. Needless to say, this dangerously futile act of appeasement on the part of Eisenhower was hailed by the extreme left-wing presidential aspirant, Hubert Humphrey).

Oozing Aggression

(Reprinted from Chattanooga NEWS-FREE PRESS)

Those who love freedom and oppose aggression are beset with a sense of deep frustration as news comes from the far reaches of Asia of a kind of Communist aggression that renders us at a distinct, and perhaps impossible, disadvantage.

There is little likelihood of atomic war. Russia is well aware that even a surprise attack could not knock out American capability to retaliate in devastating nuclear force. To make atomic attack is to invite atomic destruction, swiftly, surely. So except in the utmost extremities nuclear war is ruled out.

Though more likely to occur than atomic attack, even a Korea-type war is something the Communists perhaps are wise enough to seek to avoid. There likely would have been no Korean War except the Communists had been assured in advance by a foolish speech by Secretary of State Dean Acheson that Korea was outside the American defense perimeter. No one was more surprised than the Reds when we intervened.

The frustration of the present comes from a different type of warfare—a type at which the Reds have proved themselves highly capable, a type which we find it most difficult to counter.

To most Americans names like Laos, Bhutan, Sikkam are unfamiliar. And even the names of India and Tibet, though familiar, represent faraway lands of mystery. But in all of these places the Communists today are committing aggression in the jungles, and along barren rocky heights.

The Chinese Communist invasion and suppression of Tibet are accomplished. There are no longer any "ifs" about it. Some 80,000 Tibetans have been reported murdered—not killed in battle—by the bestial Communists as they carry out a typical systematic extermination program to eradicate any vestige of resistance. Tibet's Dalai Lama pitifully and hopelessly appeals to the UN to take up Tibet's case, ignoring the fact that the UN is as pitiful and as hopeless (though not so resolute) as oppressed Tibet.

In Laos, Communist guerrillas infiltrating through jungles to scattered villages are oozing over the countryside like a sea of irresistible mud. There is no static front. There are no battle lines. There is no concentration of Red force for the 25,000-man Laotian army to attack. It, therefore, must spread itself too thin and react when pushed by the Communists—a disastrous sort of situation when the Chinese Communists can pour in unlimited manpower.

India is disturbed about flagrant Chinese Communist invasion of some of its isolated northern territory. But India's appeasing Nehru is afraid even to speak too harshly against the invaders. And he is incapable of going to war to defend his own country effectively.

Bhutan and Sikkam nearby already have felt Red invasions and they, too, are defenseless.

And where does it all stop? The United States could commit itself for Korea, or for India. But it would be disastrous for our nation and for freedom if the United States should become embroiled in brushfire wars throughout the world at Communist instigation.

While there is no easy solution, no clearcut answer of what to do, there surely is plain indication of what we must not do. Recognizing the utter perfidy of the Communist enemy, we must not in any case in even the slightest degree permit ourselves to be guilty of appeasement. We may have to take defeats, but we do not have to surrender.

And yet in the face of aggressions ranging from Eastern Europe, through the Middle East and across Asia, there are some who still call for "concessions" and "peaceful coexistence."

Let's Be Realistic

President Eisenhower commented yesterday that continuing conversations are being held with the Chinese Communists about 452 Americans known to have fallen into Red hands and yet never accounted for.

No one really knows how many Americans the Chinese Communists hold, or have held and murdered either directly or indirectly through maltreatment.

Yet there are some who in the safety of their sheltered existence in America are eager to forget the 452, and others, and pretend the bloodthirstiness of Red China doesn't exist. Admit Red China to the UN, these internationalists plead. Give them diplomatic recognition. Deal with them, compromise with them. Be realistic, they say.

Yes, let us be realistic. The lives of 452 Americans swallowed up by Red China are something very real to consider. So are the lives of the more than 30,000 Americans taken by the Communists in the Korean War. So are the bodies of more than 100,000 Americans wounded by the Communists in the aggression in Korea.

Yes, by all means, let's be realistic about Communists.

(Reprinted from the CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS)

The 76 Recipients of US Aid

(Reprinted from Richmond (Va.) TIMES-DISPATCH)

Geography class will come to order.

How many nations are there in the world?

Eighty-seven.

How many have received financial aid from the United States since the end of World War II?

Seventy-six.

Here's a little game you can play.

First, before looking at the following list, see how many of the 87 nations you can name.

Then, consulting the list below, see if you can pick out the 10 nations (other than the United States) which have not received direct financial help from Uncle Sam since the end of World War II.

Here are the 87 nations of the world:

Afghanistan	Jordan
Albania	Korea
Argentina	Laos
Australia	Lebanon
Austria	Liberia
Belgium	Libya
Bolivia	Liechstenstein
Brazil	Luxembourg
Bulgaria	Mexico
Burma	Monaco
Cambodia	Mongolia
Canada	Morocco
Ceylon	Muscat (Oman)
Chile	Nepal
China (Taiwan)	Netherlands
Colombia	New Zealand
Costa Rica	Nicaragua
Cuba	Norway
Czechoslovakia	Pakistan
Denmark	Panama
Dominican Republic	Paraguay
Ecuador	Peru
Egypt	Philippines
Ethiopia	Poland
Finland	Portugal
France	Rumania
Germany (Federal Republic)	Russia
Great Britain	Salvador
Greece	Saudi Arabia
Ghana	South Africa
Guatemala	Spain
Haiti	Sudan
Honduras	Sweden
Hungary	Switzerland
Iceland	Syria
India	Thailand
Indonesia	Tunisia
Iran	Turkey
Iraq	United States
Ireland	Uruguay
Israel	Venezuela
Italy	Viet Nam
Japan	Yemen
	Yugoslavia

The 10 non-recipients of U. S. aid are Bulgaria, Ceylon, Finland, Liechstenstein, Monaco (of course, they did get Grace Kelly), Mongolia, Muscat (Oman), Salvador, South Africa and Switzerland.

It is to be hoped that the appalling waste reported in the expenditure of U. S. aid funds in Iran, Korea, Laos and elsewhere isn't typical of what's happened in the other beneficiaries of U. S. generosity.

Baker's Boy From Illinois

(Reprinted from Richmond, Va. TIMES-DISPATCH)

A senator's life is no bed of roses. There are times when it is more like a bed of thorns.

As the end of the session nears, it is natural for a weary legislator to dream wistfully of respite in some Shangri-la of golden sands and languorous surf, where palms and hula skirts sway to the sound of Hawaiian guitars.

But would you, gentle reader, dig down into your jeans to finance a senatorial junket-en masse to Hawaii?

That's what SENATE MINORITY LEADER DIRKSEN has, quite seriously, proposed. He has asked his colleagues to vote themselves $200,000 of our money, wherewith to pay air-freight to Honolulu for the entire membership of the Senate!

Coming from the anchor-man of Ike's senatorial "economy team," the proposal is incredible.

Dirksen, as "the baker's boy from Pekin, Illinois," made national headlines back in '32, when, as a freshman congressman, he refused to buy a dress suit for a state occasion. He rented one instead, to demonstrate his passion for economy.

We can only surmise that a politician, after so many years in Washington, and after voting hundreds of millions in taxes, loses sight of the fact that "a mere $200,000" raid on the Treasury actually a raid on the pay envelopes of the taxpayers for whom he expresses such eloquent concern--when running for re-election.

Kick Us Again!

U. S. Ambassador Philip W. Bonsal has been given the cold shoulder by Cuban dictator Fidel Castro for almost three months at this writing. The last time Bonsal saw Castro was back on June 9.

There was a time, not so long ago at that, when Washington officials would have considered such treatment an insult. That was before Uncle Sam became a punching bag for dictators of assorted sizes.

OBSOLETE?

(Reprinted from the INDIANAPOLIS STAR)

A headline says that the United Nations is short of cash, according to Dag Hammarskjold, because many countries don't pay their share. In the aggregate they still owe about three-fourths of the assessment of some $61,500,000 against them.

Apparently a lot of nations are beginning to wonder in the pocketbook department whether the U.N. and its works are worth the investment. The biggest wall-flower at the international tea party between President Eisenhower and the Soviet Premier will be the U.N. Few people have seriously considered this organization as being of any real help in solving such problems as the Berlin crisis, German reunification, etc., etc., etc.

At the moment, the U.N. is one of the most thoroughly ignored international organizations on record. There is some of the ominous air of the late 1930s when the old League of Nations collapsed because of its own weakness and the onslaught of personal diplomacy on a high level.

How They Plan To Handle The South

(Reprinted from Chattanooga NEWS-FREE PRESS)

With politicking for 1960 already well under way, there should remain no doubt in anybody's mind as to the manner in which the National Democratic Party expects to "handle" the South. The party's radical Northern leadership plans simply to silence the voice of Southerners and ignore the South's interests in the selection of a presidential nominee.

On September 16, the party bosses took their first step to carry out their anti-South scheme when the party's national committee passed a resolution designed to compel Southern support even of an anti-South party nominee. The resolution stipulates that delegates will participate in the 1960 Democratic convention "in good faith," that State Democratic leaders will try to assure that the party's nominees will go on the ballot and that state electors will be "pledged formally or in good conscience" to election of the ticket.

The next steps the Northern Democratic bosses will take are revoltingly clear. They will draw up a platform designed to trample the rights and interests of Southerners and to ignore the U. S. Constitution, and then they will pick candidates who will agree to carry out their anti-South plans.

And all the while they will be relying on their "good faith" rule to get Southerners to support a ticket radically opposed to the South.

EXTRA COPIES

THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN Newspaper

Available!

ORDER TODAY bulk copies of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN and distribute to your friends, business acquaintances, club members, and employees, etc.

GOING TO A MEETING SOON? Order your extra copies of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN to distribute there.

10 Copies	$1.00
25 Copies	$2.00
50 Copies	$4.00
100 Copies	$8.00
Over 100 Copies	$8.00 per 100

Order Today

These will be shipped to you IN BULK, POSTAGE PREPAID, ready for you to address, mail or distribute.

Please make your check payable to:

THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN

7314 Zimpel Street

New Orleans 18, Louisana

RIGHT WING EDITORIALS WANTED

Patriots, please send us right-wing, patriotic editorials which may appear in your local newspapers. However, please do not mark on them with pencil or crayon, as all newspaper editorials are reproduced in THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN by a photographic process. Thank you.

HELP SPREAD THE WORD

Every month, in order to combat the millions of words spewed out by the left-wing press, THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN distributes thousands of free sample copies.

These sample copies are paid for by the contributions sent in by our supporters, who wish in this way, to fight against the Socialists who have infiltrated every part of our government.

If you believe in the work we are doing, and if you wish to help us spread the message of Americanism contained in THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN, then please contribute to our "Distribution Fund" to help finance these free sample copies.

Just make your check out to The Independent American, 7314 Zimpel St., New Orleans, La.

THE RIGHT TO "KEEP AND BEAR ARMS"

(Reprinted from INDIANAPOLIS STAR)

Letters from readers indicate that some Hoosiers, at least, strongly and on principle disagree with the findings of the Gallup Poll that a substantial majority of Americans are in favor of laws requiring a police permit to buy any firearms or ammunition.

In their concern with trying to prevent the role of firearms in accidents and crime, too many people forget that the right to keep and bear arms is critically significant to a free people. It is one of the means--there is always the possibility it may be the decisive means--by which genuine sovereignty of the people is maintained.

It is not by caprice or accident or merely because of the temper and conditions of the times that a guarantee of the right of the people to keep and bear arms is the second item in that magnificent afterthought to the United States Constitution, the Bill of Rights. Like other protections of the individual in the Bill of Rights and in the original body of the Constitution, this was the product of a knowledge and understanding of history--the kind of history which those who fail to understand are doomed to repeat. Tyrants who seek to maintain a regime by force, without the consent of the people governed, always disarm the people.

Where police permit is required to obtain, keep or bear a firearm, the people can readily be disarmed at any time simply through control of this police power. The American people should not be so rashly confident of the security of their freedom as to make this power available for some future tyrant--whether an individual or a movement--to use.

NIXON... From Page One

United States INTENDS TO BUY THE REPUBLICAN NOMINATION just like he is able to buy anything else he wants.

And, Fulton Lewis, Jr. in a recent syndicated column stated: "The Rockefeller money can set up smooth-running political machines in every hamlet of the nation, to simulate a great nationwide surge of pro-Rockefeller sentiment, come Convention time. When it happens, it will be too late for the Nixon forces to set up their own to counter it. Nor will the money be there to finance it."

* * * * * * *

And so, Richard Nixon, candidate for the GOP Presidential nomination faces a "Rocky" road indeed!

But let us not waste any tears on Mr. Nixon. He has made his political bed - now let him lie in it. Nixon is a turncoat, plain and simple. He was originally a sincere Conservative, an anti-Communist. But he sold out himself and his personal integrity when, blinded by Presidential ambitions he renounced anti-Communism and journeyed to Moscow for the Kremlin's endorsement of his candidacy.

Where can Nixon go now? True Conservatives can't support him - he's sold out to the Appeasers. New Deal Liberals won't trust him because he was once an anti-Communist - and also, because he isn't quite as steadfastly Liberal as Nelson Rockefeller, although he has tried mighty hard.

Poor Mr. Nixon! He should have realized that he was no match for the power-mad Internationalists who control both the Democrat and the Republican parties. He should have realized that the trap laid for him by the Socialist-Internationalists was cleverly laid so that he would destroy himself!

"When he shows as seeking quarter,
with paws like hands in prayer,
That is the time of peril — the time
of the Truce of the Bear!"
— Rudyard Kipling, 1898

DISCORD... From Page One

not stop Southern states from bolting the party if the national convention displeases Dixie too much in picking its nominee and drafting its platform.

The same North-South split was evident as the committee adopted a new formula for apportioning convention delegates after spending most of the day tussling over the problem. The new formula, a creation of Chairman Butler, will aid big Northern states by doling out delegates on a strict population basis.

TONING DOWN CRITICISM

Mr. Butler, for the moment, has toned down his criticism of the Johnson-Rayburn leadership. But with Congress in adjournment, it is expected that the acid-tongued Hoosier will resume his complaints that the Texas-based leadership did not do all it could to forge a "liberal" record in Congress.

SHARPENING THE TROUBLE

Moreover, the passage of time will sharpen rather than soothe some of the Democratic troubles.

Take the matter of civil rights, a matter Congressional Democrats hoped, but failed, to dispose of in the session just ended. The Senate leadership has set next February 15 as opening day for debate on the politically explosive question of whether to offer new protection for Negro voting rights and new aid to desegregating schools. A party-splitting fight might pre[illegible]py Congress right down to convention time in Los Angeles. [illegible] impetus of this battle might lead Northerners to demand a [illegible]ronger civil rights plank in the party platform--something that could lead to a Dixiecrat bolt from the convention.

Even party professionals who want to dodge a factional fight say the civil rights issue can't be avoided next year. A Midwesterner argues: "We can't take the risk of letting more Negroes go over to the Republicans. The Negro vote could decide who gets elected President, and we stand a bigger risk of losing it than losing the South."

BOSSES... From Page One

the Roosevelt and Truman regimes, but not because big business has learned new political skills.

The legal immunity with which labor unions have been cloaked is being torn away, not by big business but by public demand.

In recent years, Americans have learned how union bosses gain power. They have learned about the brutal beatings, the violent picketing, the boycotts, the acid attacks and other techniques of union hoodlumism. The image of Jimmy Hoffa, boss of the Teamsters, is clear in the eyes of the public.

Confronted by this rotten corruption and hideous brutality, George Meany, Walter Reuther and other union bosses have done nothing. They have spoken pious words and hoped public indignation would die down.

In the face of public outrage at union behaviour, Meany has the audacity to say that unions will have to organize for "political action," as though the unions had not been in politics for decades. Reuther, in an impudent statement, blamed business for "monopoly control" of the U.S. economy and "selfish policies." He ignored the widely recognized fact that the biggest monopoly in the land is the labor movement and that it pursues selfish policies at the risk of the nation's economic health and military security.

Like the Bourbon kings of France, the bosses of organized labor refuse to learn anything new. They refuse to recognize that their days as absolute monarchs of U.S. laboring men are nearing an end.

dear reader

Unless you are a paid subscriber to this newspaper, this free sample copy may be the ONLY ONE you receive.

To Keep Up With News of

NEW PARTY ACTIVITY

mail coupon TODAY

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I wish to subscribe to "The Independent American"

NAME_____

ADDRESS_____

CITY AND STATE_____

Please send me the next 12 issues — $3.00_____

Please send me the next 24 issues — $5.00_____

Please send me a SPECIAL TRIAL OFFER

— O — 4 issues — $1.00_____

Please Make Checks Payable to

THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN

7314 Zimpel Street New Orleans 18, La.

Khrushchev Gets Bitter Greeting In New York

By Ray Vicker
Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal

Arriving here by train from Washington, where he had received a polite but cool welcome, the Russian leader became the target of shouted and scrawled jibes hurled by organized demonstrators. Local police did nothing to silence the criticism, as Washington officials had done.

"Killer Khrushchev go home" screamed one placard held high by a demonstrator as the black Cadillac carrying the Premier sped past crowds on 42nd Street. "Welcome his excellency the murderer," blared another sign.

ODE TO COMMUNISM

Jibing at Mr. Khrushchev's boast that Communism would "bury" capitalism one day, a poetic-minded but ungrammatical sign writer waved a placard reading:

"Today we make merry,
Tomorrow you we bury"

The demonstrators, many of whom said they belonged to various anti-Communist organizations in this country, shattered hopes of Government officials, both here and in Washington that the Khrushchev visit would not spark any angry public reaction.

Although the crowds were large in many places, the people were uncommonly quiet and reserved.

Said one police lieutenant who has watched many such welcomes:

"This is the coldest reception any big shot ever received in New York." Other veteran observers agreed.

Across from the main entrance of the Commodore Hotel several hundred anti-Communist demonstrators congregated to shout, boo and make wild gestures. Two dozen or more signs popped up in this group.

John Reilly, a lanky citizen who heads a group called The Veterans Committee to Combat Communism, waved a placard saying "Remember Korea." A sign held by another veteran read, "free our American soldiers."

Mr. Khrushchev may not have seen the demonstration in front of the Commodore because he was whisked into the hotel through a side entrance. But there's no doubt that others in the Soviet party and many of the 39 Soviet newsmen accompanying the premier saw and understood the signs.

TWO TELEPHONED THREATS

Earlier, the Commodore had received two telephoned threats that bombs had been placed in the hotel. City bomb squads searched the hotel and stood by as an extra precaution.

"Don't list us as Hungarians," urged a chunky American with a mid-western accent as he clutched a reporter's arm. "We are just plain Americans who are here because we don't like Communism."

Questioning disclosed that many of the demonstrators belonged to more than a half a dozen different groups, including the Hungarian freedom fighters, the Bulgarian National Front of America and the Committee for National Mourning. (Reprinted from the WALL STREET JOURNAL)

Book Review
"UP FROM LIBERALISM"

By William F. Buckley, Jr. (McDowell-Obelensky, $3.50)

Mr. Buckley's third book is a witty, urbane, controversial attack on the manners and meaning of contemporary American Liberalism.

In this thoughtful book, the author takes up many aspects of the intellectual, social and political life of contemporary America always distinguishing theory from practice, legend from fact. In the end he asks, does modern life exclude the values which were once agreed upon as essential to the free society? There is a searching, ingeniously documented study of the activities of major colleges and universities, set against the claims of academic freedom.

Following is an excerpt from UP FROM LIBERALISM by William F. Buckley, Jr.:

"Professional Liberal leaders are for the most part middle-aged and older men, who grew up under the slogans of Wilsonianism (we fought for democracy), and the New Deal (we fought for freedom from fear). They made their revolution and consolidated their positions, and occupy the influential posts, and have successfully disseminated their ideology. But there is growing up a generation that has not been so busy, fighting for Liberalism, to wonder whether Liberalism is worth fighting for. That generation's apathy is traceable not merely to the dilution of spirit that always follows a complete victory. It is a reciprocal infidelity that Liberalism itself invites. Liberalism cannot care deeply, and so cannot be cared about deeply; and so it leans, altogether, on those whom it has infauated, who cannot see far enough to see how nearby is the end of Liberalism's world."

UP FROM LIBERALISM is an able challenge to the Liberalism of our time. You may purchase a copy of UP FROM LIBERALISM from The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N.Y. Price $3.50.

The Conservative Side Of The News Now Available For Your Town

The Radio Edition of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN can be heard in your town each and every week. You can influence the thinking of thousands of your friends and neighbors when you help to have the RADIO EDITION OF THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN broadcast over a radio station in your town.

Individuals and Committees of patriotic Americans in Gainesville, Florida; in Greenville, South Carolina; in Kermit, Texas; and in Selma, Alabama, have made it possible for THE RADIO EDITION to be heard in those towns each and every week.

The cost of sponsoring radio programs is very inexpensive. In some cases the manager of the radio stations have agreed to play these radio programs of news from the Conservative point of view as a public service; all the committee had to do was to call on the owner and manager of the Radio Station and tell them that this program is available free of charge when played as a public service. This is the case in Gainesville, Florida, and in Selma, Alabama!

Write to us today for some samples of our recent radio programs on tape. Full details on how you can help get the conservative side of the news on your radio station will be sent to you by return mail!

Please address your request to Kent Courtney, News Commentator, THE RADIO EDITION OF THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN, P. O. Box 4223, New Orleans, La.

38 Were Spineless—or Worse

The UN General Assembly Tuesday took the only logical and reasonable step possible in dealing with the question of UN membership for Communist China. For the ninth consecutive year it adopted a resolution not to consider the matter of Red Chinese representation at the current session.

Although the UN action in voting to bar Red China was the proper one, there were nevertheless some disturbing aspects about the vote itself. The ballots on whether to forego consideration of Red Chinese membership were cast as follows: 44 for, 29 against and 9 abstaining.

Last year, on the same question, the vote was almost the same: 44 for, 28 against and 9 abstaining. In other words, the Red Chinese, who are presently engaged in vicious aggression against Laos, Tibet and India—aggression which should brand them indelibly as the murderers they are and arouse the disgust of the whole world—have actually picked up one more vote than last year in favor of their admission to the UN.

Red China's list of crimes is a long one and one that continues to grow and to horrify the Free World. It is a sad commentary on the UN General Assembly that 38 of its members are willing either to ignore or to excuse those crimes and refuse to cast their ballots against the irresponsible criminals at the head of the Red Chinese government.

(Reprinted from Chattanooga NEWS-FREE PRESS)

STATES RIGHTS ARE OUR LAST BULWARK

By Congressman James C. Davis

(Below are excerpts from a recent broadcast over the Manion Forum Network).

The Tenth Amendment wrote State sovereignty into our Constitution. It did it in firm and unmistakable language. This is the language: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people."

There is nothing ambiguous in this. It is clear. It means that when the Constitution was adopted, the Tenth Amendment expressed the specific intention of the people that the powers not specifically granted to the United States were reserved to the individual states or to the people. In adopting it, the people refused to grant any unspecified powers to the Federal Government. They reserved all unspecified powers to the states or to the people.

This doctrine is a part of the Constitution, as it was when the Amendment was adopted. It has been a part of the Constitution every moment since its adoption. The struggle to maintain the Constitution against its enemies at home as well as abroad is a never ending struggle. The battle is always on, although many Americans have never yet realized it.

Today we are waging a war with a brutal Communist philosophy, whose disciples have definitely, unequivocally announced their intention to destroy the United States of America. Coupled with that threat from abroad, almost daily we have renewed and intensified assaults from enemies within our own borders.

What the Tenth Amendment provides for is local self-government geared to the local and peculiar conditions of the people in their own localities.

The Tenth Amendment takes into consideration local limitations, customs, habits, patterns of living and, above all else, local needs. It sprang from the knowledge that state legislatures, state governors, mayors, local judges, county commissioners, sheriffs, and county tax collectors are closer to the people; that they are in a position to administer justice, to assess taxes, to wisely spend the tax money, and to meet the local needs of their own people, better than any central government that is far removed from the local scene and unfamiliar with the needs of the locality.

For more than a hundred and fifty years, we followed the Constitution; we respected this principle; we were a strong, contented and prosperous people, with a civilization and a degree of liberty unknown before in the history of mankind.

RADICALS WOULD BLOT OUT STATES

This picture has changed today. We are in danger of losing the very things that have made us great, and made us a blessing to so much of the rest of the world. In the past twenty years or so, the trend has been to destroy state functions; to weaken and, in fact, to eliminate state lines.

For more than two decades just past, men with radical ideas regarding the functions of government have come upon the scene. These innovators brought with them ideas and proposals to change our Constitutional form of government into a welfare state, a centralized government, with our states relegated to a weak, subservient position, exercising only those powers and functions that might be assigned to them by an all-powerful, arrogant, dictatorial, centralized Federal Government.

The Communist know that the destruction of state lines carries with it the destruction of state sovereignty--that the destruction of state sovereignty and the establishment of centralized bureaucracy means destruction of individual liberty and freedom.

That is why every Communist every fellow traveller and every well-wisher of Communism supports every movement against state sovereignty and in favor of centralized power. It makes the Communists' objective of taking over our Government easier.

The rank and file of our people, who actually constitute an unorganized majority, must organize to save state sovereignty. If we do this, we shall keep our country strong.

It is thus that we shall be able to preserve the last remaining bastion of freedom remaining in a world fighting for its very life against Communism and dictatorship.

As a matter of simple survival, we must preserve Constitutional government; we must maintain a balance of power between Federal and state government. State sovereignty is the bulwark against centralized bureaucratic power. It is the protector of individual liberty. It is the last bastion against Communism.

(Editor's Note: Dean Clarence Manion's weekly radio program is heard on stations throughout the nation. If you are interested in knowing if a station near to you is broadcasting his Conservative message, please write for information to: The Manion Forum, South Bend Indiana.)

SEND NAMES FOR OUR MAILING LIST

PLEASE SEND ONLY NAMES OF PERSONS WHO YOU THINK WOULD BE INTERESTED IN READING THIS NEWSPAPER. WE SHALL BE HAPPY TO SEND THEM A SAMPLE COPY

White House Extravagance

From time to time we have listed the lush way in which Eisenhower has run the White House. The question is: How much more is hidden? Things keep coming out accidentally.

For instance, last week during dispute on entirely different grounds, Reserve Army Col. Willard Rockwell, formerly an assistant to the defense secretary said: **"The White House has bought seven of our Air Commander planes. I can't even sell one to the military. How's that for influence?"**

Up to this statement, most Americans believed that Eisenhower had just one Air Commander plane used to fly him back and forth between Gettysburg and the White House and on short trips. This is a most expensive two-motored executive plane. NOW we find that they have seven —one for every day in the week, possibly.

(Reprinted from Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader)

"LAW DAY" EXPOSED

By Dan Smoot

(Excerpts from THE DAN SMOOT REPORT)

On August 26, 1959, William P. Rogers, United States Attorney General, spoke to a convention of the American Bar Association at Miami Beach, Florida, asking the lawyers to put pressure on the U.S. Senate for repeal of the "Connally Amendment" which permits the United States to decide what disputes it will submit to the International Court of Justice.

A significant story lies behind Rogers' speech. It is quite incredible to well-intentioned Americans who cannot believe that the elected and appointed leaders of this nation--sworn to defend our Constitution--would consider an effort to eliminate the Constitution, destroy America as an independent nation, and convert this once-free republic into a helpless province of a communist-socialist dominated one-world government.

LAW DAY

The subtlest, and most sinsiter, tactic which the one-worlders have ever conceived exploded suddenly into public consciousness on May 1, 1958: the first "Law Day, U.S.A." This was the formal launching of a drive to push us into world government by subjecting our nation to the jurisdiction of the World Court.

When President Eisenhower proclaimed the first Law Day for May 1, 1958, it seemed like a good idea to some. For years, May Day had been considered a Communist celebration. Now we were going to capture that day from them here in America and set it aside as a day to pay tribute to law and order and justice.

All over the nation on May 1, 1958, there was a sudden spate of rhetoric about world peace through world law. To informed Americans, it seemed a bit silly -- an overdose of meaningless platitudes. Before long, however, it was apparent that our Law Day, U.S.A. was something significant.

Throughout 1958, ghost writers kept inserting into President Eisenhower's speeches highsounding phrases such as "the imperative need to depose the rule of force, and to enthrone the rule of law in international differences."

It was obvious that some subtle new scheme was afoot, but it was not until September 2, 1958, that the specific direction and objectives of the plot became apparent to the public.

On that day, Attorney General William P. Rogers made a speech at the New York University Law Center. His subject was "International Order Under Law."

The Attorney General quoted some of the President's phrases about "deposing the rule of force" and "enthroning the rule of law." He deplored the fact that the nations of the world were not using the World Court as a means of settling their disputes. He placed the blame on the Connally Amendment--by which the United States reserved the right to decide what cases would go before the court.

Mr. Rogers made it clear that the world could not trust the United States to decide fairly what is, or is not, within its domestic jurisdiction--but that the United States could trust the court of foreign judges not to infringe on our domestic matters.

REPEAL THE CONNALLY AMENDMENT

Mr. Rogers closed his September 2, 1958, speech by saying that the time has come to "reexamine the domestic jurisdiction reservation" --that is, to repeal the Connally Amendment.

By the end of 1958, Arthur Larson (former ghost writer for the President) had been detached from full time duty at the White House and established as head of the Rule of Law Center at Duke University Law School.

In all of his interviews and speeches since he went to Duke, Arthur Larson says the first thing we must do to have peace on earth is to repeal the Connally Amendment so that the World Court can take whatever jurisdiction it pleases over the affairs of the United States.

Almost simultaneously with the publicity buildinup for Arthur Larson as the messenger of peace through law, there developed a similar press-agentry campaign for Charles S. Rhyne, 1957-58 President of the American Bar Association, now chairman of its "Peace through Law" Committee.

The Rhyne speeches are almost exactly like the Larson speeches. The two men use the same approach, the same trite phrases, present the same arguments, and come to the same conclusion.

If asked whether there is danger that the Court will infringe on matters that are purely domestic, they snort "of course not." If asked whether the Soviets will submit to the compulsory jurisdiction of the court if we set the example, they say that the Soviets will ultimately be shamed into doing so. They have not yet explained why the revulsion of the civilized world did not shame the Soviets into stopping their slaughter of Hungarian patriots.

On March 24, 1959, Senator Hubert Humphrey (Democrat, Minnesota) introduced a resolution to repeal the Connally Amendment--that is, to strike the six words, AS DETERMINED BY THE UNITED STATES, from the old Morse resolution of 1946.

On April 13, 1959, Vice President Nixon speaking to the Academy of Political Science, in New York, made a speech very much like the standardized speeches of Arthur Larson and Charles Rhyne. Nixon dwelt on the horrors of war and spoke wistfully of world peace through world law. He listed the Connally Amendment as a major obstacle to that ideal goal and said that the administration "will shortly submit to the Congress recommendations for modifying this reservation."

Both parties are now officially on record as sponsoring repeal of the Connally Amendment.

SOME OF THE DANGERS

Communists all over the world (including those in our own State Department) have, ever since Alger Hiss was in the Department, agitated to take the Panama Canal away from the United States and "internationalize" it. This is a matter involving the vital security interests of this nation -- which the World Court would obviously take jurisdiction over, if the Connally Amendment were repealed.

The World Court is composed of fifteen judges, ONLY ONE OF WHICH CAN BE FROM AMERICA. COMMUNIST NATIONS DO NOT--AND WILL NOT--ACCEPT JURISDICTION OF THE COURT; BUT THEY HAVE JUDGES ON IT. Nine judges constitute a quorum for the court; and a majority of the quorum is enough for a decision--from which there is no appeal. The judges are elected by the United Nations General Assembly and by the UN Security Council.

In other words, if we repeal the Connally Amendment, five judges chosen by the UN can declare the Constitution of the United States and its Bill of Rights void--and can order the American people to support the rest of the world, as long as the dollars last.

WHAT PATRIOTS CAN DO

One hopeful thing is apparent in this whole drive: it is exclusively a propaganda drive, at present. In all the "World Peace through World Law" speeches--whether they are made by Nixon or Charles Rhyne, or Arthur Larson or Attorney General Rogers, or Henry Luce, or Hubert Humphrey, or whomever--is the insistent theme that we must CONDITION PUBLIC OPINION to accept this thing.

That should give American pasriots their cue: they must condition public opinion to reject the whole sinister plot, and to turn ALL of the plotters out of office.

ATTENTION!

CIVIC CLUBS, NEW PARTIES
PATRIOTIC ORGANIZATIONS — STATES RIGHTERS
POLITICAL CLUBS
CITIZENS COUNCILS
UP TO 100 FREE COPIES
OF THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN
AVAILABLE TO YOU WRITE US YOUR NEEDS